DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 685 FL 024 991

AUTHOR Short, Deborah J.
TITLE Integrating Language and Culture in the Social Studies. A Final Report to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.; National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, Santa Cruz, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1996-03-00
NOTE 109p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; Classroom Techniques; Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Education; Curriculum Development; Discourse Analysis; *English (Second Language); Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Materials; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; *Language Minorities; *Language Role; Material Development; Middle Schools; Second Language Instruction; *Social Studies

ABSTRACT

The report details a study of ways in which classroom teachers can promote language minority students' academic linguistic competence in English, develop and implement social studies lessons that are sensitive to the cultural and educational backgrounds of language minority students, and help these students adapt to the school-based culture. The study includes examination of middle school social studies (U.S. history and world history) classrooms at several sites around the United States to identify which academic language and culture demands of this content area pose difficulties for these students and which strategies promote student success. Three focal areas are: academic discourse in social studies classes; common social studies activities; and the resources concerning different cultures that students bring to the classroom. Results in each of these areas are summarized. Appended materials include a list of the specific research questions, textbook analysis protocols, and a list of project publications. Contains 101 references. (MSE)

INTEGRATING LANGUAGE AND CULTURE IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES

A FINAL REPORT TO THE US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

Submitted by Deborah J. Short
Center for Applied Linguistics

National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning

March 1996

Integrating Language and Culture in the Social Studies

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people assisted during the course of this five-year project. The help of two research assistants was invaluable, Cindy Mahrer and Christopher Montone. Their energy and dedication to the project was a consistent guiding light. The study certainly could not have succeeded without the willing support and participation of the teachers whose classrooms we entered and became a part of. Andrea Elfin, Sally Frekot, and Robin Liten-Tejada not only acted as pilot teachers, but were co-authors of the curriculum units we developed. They brought wonderful experience and insights to the integration of language, culture and social studies. The other teachers who tested our materials, gathered student work, kept journals, and encouraged our efforts were: Larry Brooks, Rob Emison, Carol Enseki-Miller, Lori Dumerer, James Garwood, James Murray, and Linda Nelson. Additional feedback was provided by Brien Conneally and David Mullaney.

Many interns and assistants spent long hours transcribing audiotapes for this project, analyzing textbooks, and researching areas of the literature, among them: Gillian Cosgrove, Margaret Crandall, Jennifer Grocer, Kaprice Lynch, Andrea Mola, Penni Patton, Olga Padillo-Falto, Jeff Solomon, Anthony Terrizzi, and Lynn Thompson. Overall, the leadership and direction of Donna Christian and G. Richard Tucker of the Center for Applied Linguistics and Barry McLaughlin and Eugene García of the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning were most appreciated.

Although this research project was supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), through a subcontract from the University of California, Santa Cruz, the findings and opinions expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI.

Integrating Language and Culture in the Social Studies

This research project is investigating ways in which classroom teachers can promote students' academic linguistic competence in their second language, develop and implement social studies lessons that are sensitive to the cultural and educational backgrounds of the language minority students, and help these students adapt to the school-based culture. We are examining middle school social studies (American history and World history) classrooms in several sites across the US, to identify which academic language and culture demands of this content area pose difficulties for these students and which strategies promote student success.

As one component of this research project, we focus on the academic discourse in social studies classes. We are collecting and analyzing samples of the linguistic competence students need to succeed in the classes from textbooks, assignments, classroom interaction and teacher talk. We are looking at the cultural competence (background schema) students in general are expected to bring to the classes and how much language minority students have. Further, we will try to identify specific cultural concepts that are difficult for these students to comprehend.

Another part of the research is studying the common activities that occur in social studies classes to determine if they complement what students can do or are experienced doing. For example, we observe if students are familiar/comfortable with role playing, research reporting, cooperative learning, etc. If they are not, we will try to identify effective techniques teachers use to enhance student participation in these activities.

As a third part of the research, we are investigating the resources these students can bring to the classroom (e.g., information about different cultural customs) to expand the global perspective of social studies and the methods teachers use to elicit this information and incorporate it into their lessons. Overall, we hope to identify promising practices that effective teachers use to help language minority students participate actively in class, develop English proficiency, and learn about American culture while sharing information about their own.

We intend several products to result from this research:

- A structured listing of the academic language needed for middle school social studies classes.
- The development of integrated language and content social studies lesson plans.
- A workshop package for training teachers to integrate language and content and encourage multicultural awareness among all students.

For more information, contact Deborah Short, Project Director, Center for Applied Linguistics. 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, 202-429-9292.

INTEGRATING LANGUAGE AND CULTURE IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

Educators in the United States are very cognizant of the major demographic changes that have occurred in the K-12 educational system over the past decades. Schools have enrolled increasing numbers of ethnically, racially, linguistically, and culturally diverse students during this time and a microcosm of the pluralistic American society is found in many classrooms. An analysis of student enrollment data in public schools from the 1985-86 school year through 1991-92 revealed the number of English language learners (ELLs) grew 68.6% during that period while total student enrollment only increased by 6.1% (R.W-B Olsen, 1994).

The research described in this report was motivated by the changes occurring in the K-12 student population in U.S. schools and the resultant implications for students who are confronted with learning English as well as subject matter material. Many factors influence the success of students from non-English speaking backgrounds, among them language learning, access to content classes, sociocultural dimensions, educational backgrounds, and more. The study presented here has examined the interplay of many of the above factors in middle school social studies classes that serve culturally diverse students who are learning English.

Background

The rapidly growing diversity in U.S. schools and the concern for preparing linguistically and culturally diverse students for academic settings have led to important programmatic and instructional changes. New language and academic programs have been designed and existing ones modified to accommodate the needs of English language learners who must develop their language skills and also master the academic content of their classes. It has been concluded that traditional English as a second language (ESL) programs that focus on language development with little attention to subject area curricula have not been able to serve many language minority students well, especially those who are underschooled (Collier, 1994; Minicucci & Olsen, 1993). Most

students have shown sufficient growth in acquiring social language skills (e.g., reading and conversational skills geared to many out-of-school and survival interactions) but have been less successful in acquiring the language needed to fulfill school tasks like reading and comprehending textbooks, participating in content-related classroom discourse, writing research reports, and so forth. As a result, attention has intensified on strategies to enhance the development of academic language for ELLs. Many researchers have examined the length of time needed to develop appropriate academic language skills and concluded that the process–as currently offered in many schools (e.g., transitional bilingual education, pull-out English as a second language)–requires four to seven years for students to achieve a level of proficiency in academic English comparable to the average, mainstreamed English-speaking student (Collier, 1987, 1989, 1994; Cummins, 1980). Unfortunately, many programs and students themselves (such as those at the secondary level) do not have this much time to spend learning English through the standard mode. Alternative programs and instructional approaches are needed.

While limited proficiency in English has been one barrier to the academic success of language minority students, sociocultural factors have indicated others. It has been documented that children who are not part of the dominant culture have, in general, not succeeded as well in school as children from the dominant culture. Many educators and researchers have focused their attention on the reasons for this differential success. They have often considered the relationships among the culture of the classroom, the culture of the teachers and students, and the culture of the educational system in their analyses.

Some educational anthropologists have criticized the educational system for not adapting to serve culturally diverse students. The criticism is based on the premise that most instruction in U.S. schools remains traditional in nature; that is, teachers are the transmitters of information and the students are the receivers (Goodlad, 1984, Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Knowledge is often shared in a unidirectional manner through lectures and textbook readings. As Banks and Banks (1989), Crawford (1993), and Mehan (1991), among others, have explained, this traditional style of instruction does not benefit the culturally diverse student well. Nieto (1992), García (1994),

and Erickson and Shultz (1991) have explained that a student's culture can influence learning style, communication style, involvement in class, and value placed on education. In reviewing multicultural education practices in American schools, Sleeter and Grant (1987) have pointed out that the different learning styles among African American and Latino American children do not correspond with the dominant instructional and learning styles of most schools. They recommend that teachers become familiar with these learning styles so they can prepare bridging lessons and activities in order to introduce students to classroom expectations and to facilitate their success in school.

A related explanation of the underachievement of culturally diverse children is that the current educational system is too Euro-centered in terms of its curriculum and materials; teachers; instructional, placement and testing practices; and school policies to adequately serve the needs of diverse learners (Banks & Banks, 1989; Crawford, 1993; May, 1993). The present educational system was founded when many children who attended school had similar appearances and similar backgrounds; European American. Those students who did not have the same backgrounds were expected to assimilate as quickly as possible to become members of the dominant culture. In so doing, many children had to leave their cultural heritages behind. This expectation should no longer apply to today's educational system; children should not be expected to assimilate, to join the "melting pot" of American society. Instead, their cultural heritages should be valued and respected and should become part of the education community. However, most schools systems have not changed to accommodate the new perspective.

Several courses of action have been taken to mitigate the linguistic and sociocultural differences. One solution to the linguistic barrier has been the integration of language and content instruction in various program types–bilingual, ESL, sheltered and regular mainstream programs. This instructional approach is increasingly found in elementary and secondary school curricula. A recent study (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1994) showed that approximately 15% of the school systems in the United States offer at least one course that integrates language and content instruction. This research revealed, however, that great variety exists in these courses in terms of

type of program, type of teacher, subject area, type of learner, use of native language, and more. Nonetheless, the approach is committed to designing lessons and curricula that teach students academic skills and content knowledge while they are in the process of mastering English.

Language educators often integrate language and content objectives through content-based ESL or content-based language instruction. In this approach, the language educator maintains a primary focus on language skill development but has a subsidiary goal of preparing students for the mainstream classroom. (Cantoni-Harvey, 1987; Crandall, 1993; Mohan, 1986; Short, 1989). For language educators implementing content-based instruction, it is important to provide practice in academic skills and tasks that students will need when they are placed in mainstream classes (Adamson, 1990; Mohan, 1990; Chamot & O'Malley, 1987).

The integration of language and content instruction also occurs among regular classroom and content teachers. This type of approach may be termed sheltered instruction if all students in the class are English language learners, or language-sensitive content instruction if the class is heterogeneous with both English speaking and English language learning students. The main focus of these classes is content comprehension; however, the teachers are often trained in ESL techniques to make their instruction more accessible to those students learning English (Crandall, 1993; Short, 1989).

Considering the culture of a classroom has been another avenue for understanding the underachievement of language minority students. Culture reflects the patterns of behavior and the patterns for behavior that are shared within a community as well as the material products produced. Culture is not static; rather, it can be co-constructed by the individuals within a community and can change according to the context. If students are not succeeding in school, the culture of the classroom may provide information as to why this is so.

Many factors influence the creation of a classroom culture. The attitudes, interests and behaviors of the students and the teachers, the expectations for academic learning and social skills-building, the language of instruction, the pedagogy, testing practices, instructional materials, and more combine to create a classroom community that has a shared culture. Each individual—

teacher, student, aide—brings his or her own personal culture into the classroom, accompanied by cultural assumptions regarding learning and teaching. In a number of instances, a composite culture is created in which each individual has had a hand in shaping. In other instances, however, one culture prevails and it is most often the teacher's.

In an attempt to shape a composite culture in the classroom, this project has attempted to infuse more information about the students' cultural backgrounds into the middle school social studies curriculum and to provide activities that challenge different cognitive learning styles. Furthermore, multiple perspectives on history have been offered and the roles and activities of non-dominant cultures present in the historical period being studied have been illuminated.

Integrating language, culture and social studies

This project chose to examine classes where academic content was linked to language learning and where the culture of the classroom was, in part, expressed through instructional practices and materials. The research design reflects the belief that the classroom that integrates language, content, and culture is an excellent place to scaffold instruction for students learning English. According to Vygotsky (1978) and others, students' language learning is promoted through social interaction and contextualized communication, which can be readily generated in all subject areas. With teacher facilitation, students can construct meaning from texts and classroom discourse and can be assisted to understand complex content concepts. Without teacher assistance, English language learners may flounder in content area courses. As Mohan (1990) explains, these learners are involved in a process of "language socialisation," learning their second language while learning the subject matter. Guided teacher assistance will help these students become socialized to the academic language setting.

Social studies, a core subject area, was viewed as an ideal discipline through which to examine the culture of the classroom, teachers and students. The teaching of social studies provides opportunities for the students to reflect on their heritage and the role their countries and peoples play and have played in the world. Through social studies lessons, ELLs also learn about

their new country–its history, culture, government, traditions, and more. In addition, because many language educators enjoy incorporating history and culture into their ESL lessons, social studies acts as a catalyst for content-based language classes. Furthermore, social studies, by definition, is the study of societies and cultures and their interactions and interrelationships in the United States and around the world. After having been trained in the discipline and having had coursework in specific histories and cultures of peoples in the world, social studies educators, one might infer, would be more welcoming of cultural diversity in the classroom, more knowledgeable of the students' cultural heritages, and more able to incorporate multicultural practices into classroom instruction.

However, we hypothesized that social studies would be academically more challenging for English language learners than other subjects because it demands a high level of literacy skills and is predicated on students being familiar with extensive background knowledge. In the NCSS Task Force report (Jarolimek, 1989), which identified essential skills for social studies, many higher-order thinking skills, like interpreting information, drawing inferences, representing print information visually, and identifying alternative courses of action and their consequences, begin to be emphasized in the scope and sequences at the middle school level. In terms of Cummins' framework (1981), social studies, in general, represents cognitively-demanding and context-reduced communication.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This five-year research project had a qualitative, ethnographic focus that included participant observation in the research classrooms and interviews with stakeholders. It involved discourse analysis techniques. The research had two phases and several components to each phase. In the first phase, we studied middle school American history, which is taught in grade 6, 7 or 8, depending on the school system. In the second phase, we conducted a similar study in World social studies classes. The phase components included: reviews of relevant literature and curricula; materials development; teacher training; classroom observations and interviews; and analyses of academic social studies language from classroom discourse, textbooks and student assignments.

The research questions were broadly concerned with the integration of social studies content and English language learning and the associated instructional practices being offered to the linguistically and culturally diverse students in U.S. schools. (See Appendix A for the research questions.) More specifically, the project examined ways in which social studies knowledge is constructed in middle school classrooms with students who are learning English as a second language, and the linguistic and cultural competencies students need to engage effectively in this domain of discourse and learning. In this project, we have investigated ways in which classroom teachers of social studies strengthen the academic language competence of English language learners, develop and implement lessons that are not only sensitive to the cultural and educational backgrounds of the students but also reflect the cultural diversity present in the historical time period, and explore the knowledge students bring to the social studies classroom in order to help them act as multicultural informants. The study has also identified effective instructional practices teachers use to guide students to accomplish socially and academically meaningful tasks.

The project has been implemented through the active participation of classroom teachers. These teachers acted as consultants and writers during the materials development component, piloted and field-tested the materials–keeping teaching logs and samples of student work, participated in the project training seminars, and several also became trainers themselves,

presenting workshops with project staff at professional conferences. They included ESL teachers, social studies teachers, and bilingual teachers. Teachers for the American history phase worked in schools in Virginia, Maryland, New York, Florida, California, and Nebraska. World studies teachers taught in Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, Illinois, Texas, and California.

The field-testing of the instructional materials was conducted in a variety of classroom settings. In some cases, sheltered social studies classes with only English language learners participated. Some of these classes had students with a low-intermediate level of English proficiency; a few had beginning level students. In the other cases, mainstream classes of 25-37 students were involved, with a range of two to twelve English language learners. Four of these classes also included some mainstream students and some students with learning disabilities; one class had a student with severe physical handicaps. The materials were also field-tested in bilingual classrooms where the instruction was provided in Spanish and English.

In general, a phase was implemented as follows. An initial literature review took place on such topics as: current trends in social studies instruction; research in classroom discourse, academic language, and the integration of language and content instruction; content-area reading instruction, and multicultural education. Then middle school level curricula and popular commercial textbooks were reviewed for the subject area. (See appendix B.) These two activities served a dual purpose. For one, they informed the materials development phase. For another, they provided general information on the academic language of social studies. During the early months of each phase, we also made initial observations in the respective social studies classes.

Although the two phases were designed similarly in terms of their activities, the actual implementation differed. Selecting school sites and participant teachers was relatively easy for the American history phase. All schools across the United States offer an American history course at some point during the middle/junior high school years and the curricula correspond closely. The World studies phase presented a different situation however. There is no consistency across the U.S., not even in the same state sometimes, as to what World social studies class ELLs might receive. In some areas World Geography was the course; in others, Ancient Civilizations or

Studies of the Non-Western World or even World History to a certain cutoff date was offered. For some school systems, World studies courses were only offered at the high school level. This variation had implications for both our materials development component and our field-testing process. The second phase, therefore, was field-tested across a wider range of school levels, although for the most part we were able to focus on grades 6-9.

Next, the project staff worked with two local teachers (ESL and social studies) to develop a thematic curriculum unit that would incorporate language development, subject matter, and higher-order thinking objectives. *Protest and the American Revolution* (Short, Mahrer, Elfin, Liten-Tejada, & Montone, 1994), the American history unit, highlighted a theme of protest and related it to the events leading to and including the American Revolution. *Conflicts in World Cultures* (Short, Montone, Frekot & Elfin, 1996), four mini-units for World studies, was designed around conflict and conflict resolution between cultures or philosophies. In this way, we attempted to match at least some of the varied World studies curricula, offering units that reflected different time periods and geographic regions. The topics were: The Incas and the Conquistadors, The Reformation, The Opening of Trade between Japan and the U.S., and The Struggle to Maintain Independence in Ethiopia.

These units were piloted by the teacher-authors and reviewed by other history and ESL teachers for accuracy of content objectives and appropriateness of methodology. During the pilot, project staff conducted classroom observations, audiotaping most of them for later transcription, interviewed teachers and students, and collected samples of student assignments. The pilot teachers kept teaching logs of the lesson implementations and recorded areas of difficulty and interest for students as well as modifications and additions made to the original design.

At each phase, the project was then expanded to include a more national perspective. In the summer before the next school year, a training institute was held for new teachers that demonstrated techniques for teaching content to English language learners and prepared the teachers to implement the thematic unit. Revisions to the materials, based on the pilot and reviewers' feedback, also took place during that time. These new teachers then field-tested the

materials over the next year. Project staff traveled to several of the sites to conduct observations and interviews and to gather samples of student work. As in the pilot, participating teachers kept logs of the implementation process, describing students' reaction to lessons, modifications made to the planned activities, suggestions for improvement, and so forth. During the World studies phase, some of the teachers videotaped or audiotaped several of the lessons and sent them to us for transcription and analysis. After the field-testing was completed, the units were revised a final time and made available to the public.

Meanwhile, throughout the life of the project, analysis of the academic language of social studies took place. Using discourse analysis techniques, transcription data from the classroom audiotapes, student written assignments, and textbook chapters were examined in order to identify and typologize the academic language features of social studies. During this process, we considered both language associated with classroom routines (which were linked to the classroom culture) and language and activities specifically targeted to the social studies objectives. We also distinguished between language used by the teachers, the students and the materials.

LITERATURE REVIEW

We began our research with literature reviews of trends in social studies instruction and research on classroom-based discourse analysis. This literature review process continued throughout the life of the project, so our research would be informed by up-to-date findings and changes in educational philosophies. One example of change that occurred during the five years, was the development, publication, and early implementation of national standards geared to social studies courses. We closely followed the development of the National Standards for United States History, the National Standards for World History, the National Standards for the Social Studies, the National Geography Standards, and the National Standards for Civics Education. The project investigator served as a reviewer for three of those standards. As these standards were disseminated in the public education arena, we took care to match the objectives of our curriculum units with those proposed by the national orgnaizations. This matching did not result in a one-to-one correspondence for each topic, because we also included state and local curricular objectives in our design.

The two literature reviews that follow played a significant role in shaping our research. We compared literature findings with results from our classroom observations, transcript analyses of classroom discourse, and social studies textbook analyses. We found many similarities as will be described in the next section of this report. One item of interest to us was the interface between actual and recommended pedagogical practices. We, too, found many "traditional" social studies classrooms at first, but discovered that through professional development of the teachers and the appropriate instructional materials, those classrooms could be transformed into positive learning environments such as those cited in the literature. Likewise, we found that teachers needed some training and awareness of the ways to encourage students, and in particular English language learners, to use extended discourse in the social studies classroom.

Trends in Social Studies Education

The main goal of social studies continues to be citizenship. Thorton (1994) conducted a major review of social studies curriculum and instruction and identified three major trends in curriculum approach that have dominated discussion on social studies education: 1) a citizenship transmission model; 2) a scaled-down social sciences model; and 3) a critical thinking approach. Of the three, the most stable and widely used is the first, citizenship transmission. This approach to social studies teaching entails the transmission of factual and procedural knowledge from teachers to students, mainly in an imitative process. It often manifests itself with a discourse style following a recitation (initiation-response-evaluation) model of classroom instruction.

In the 1960's, the social sciences model arose as researchers, such as Jerome Bruner, began to advocate "discovery learning." According to this model, students learn by actively questioning the principles and concepts of social science components such as history, geography, economics, and government. In this way, students are asked to approximate the academic inquiry practiced by social scientists. As carried out in the classroom, however, the social science model has been more "mimetic than transformative;" thereby approximating, in effect, the transmission model (Thorton, 1994). Seixas (1993) suggested a possible reason for this may have been that teachers' distance from the academic community causes them to see content knowledge as being constructed by others. Since they receive and accept their content knowledge in college as "inert, opaque information," it is not surprising that many of them pass that information on as such.

Critical thinking, the third trend, is more of a pedagogical approach than a model. As such, it can be implemented in any model to provide students with opportunities to make connections between their experiences and the curriculum, question commonly held assumptions about the world, and take away different understandings from a lesson. This approach values reasoning and cognitive processes over regurgitation of facts.

Thorton (1994) concluded that while remnants of each model or approach can be found in curriculum and pedagogy, the citizenship transmission/recitation model predominates. Moreover, teachers continue to teach as they have been taught. Despite the variety of pedagogical models,

Thorton found that instructional practices being used at the end of the 20th century to foster citizenship, have nevertheless remained fairly stable since the middle of the century. As a result of his analysis, he strongly affirmed that curriculum innovations are not likely to bring about significant changes in student outcomes without corresponding changes in pedagogy and outlook among teachers.

Nonetheless, in the last decade, the social studies curriculum has been criticized for focusing too much on specific facts, broad conclusions from history and other social science fields, rather than on critical thinking skills, social science concepts, and social participation (*A Nation at Risk* , 1983). Moreover, teachers generally recognize that instruction is based too much on the recitation model (Davis, 1984). Therefore, after the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools' Curriculum Task Force recommended that social studies instruction be more exciting and focused on critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Suggested activities for accomplishing these goals were "reading, writing, observing, debating, role play, simulations, and the use of statistical data...." The recitation model of instruction was rejected in favor of "more active approaches to learning" (Mullins, 1990). It remains to be seen if curricula and pedogogical changes will be implemented in the future.

Extensive reviews of the literature on subject-matter teaching in general and on social studies in particular have been done by Brophy, McMahon and Prawatt (1991). Their findings identified the following as features of curriculum that promote understanding and application: 1) the curriculum balances breadth and depth by sufficiently developing knowledge on a more limited range of topics; 2) a limited number of "powerful" ideas form a framework for the content; 3) relationships and connection between these ideas are made during instruction; 4) students are actively involved in processing information and constructing meaning; and 5) higher-level thinking skills, such as critical thinking, are integrated into the curriculum and exercised within contexts that allow students to connect content knowledge with their personal lives and experiences.

Pointing to Vygotskian theory of the social construction of knowledge and the benefits of cooperative learning, Seixas (1993) suggested that history teaching and learning might be

"conceptualized around students' questioning of their own culture and experience, an investigation of the past that questions its traces and theorizes its legacy and import for the present." Olmeda (1993, 1994) offered examples of how teachers can encourage students to become "junior historians" by promoting activities that allow them to interview elders in their families and communities about historical topics in which the elders had had a personal involvement. Such interviews would not only lend themselves to the range of social science disciplines, but when done with bilingual or ESL students, would also provide opportunities to develop the fundamental language skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

Risinger (1992) reviewed contemporary literature, reports, and guidelines to summarize trends in K-12 social studies. His recommendations included: 1) a more in-depth treatment of history, and a movement away from mere memorization of facts; 2) more focus on social history and geography; 3) a blend of global multiculturalism with traditional western civilization; 4) increased attention to ethics and values; 5) increased attention to the role of religion in society, understanding and comparing world religions; 6) attention to controversial issues, using a variety of primary and secondary source material and viewing issues and events from multiple perspectives; 7) covering issues in depth so students can develop perspective and thoughtful judgment; and more attention to writing to enhance in-depth coverage of issues.

Social studies text analysis

Brophy, McMahon and Prowatt (1991) presented the findings of an expert panel convened to critique the 1988 Silver, Burdett and Ginn social studies series. The series was considered to be representative of popular textbooks commonly used in schools. The experts recommended that the series cover in more depth the international aspects of American history, provide more exposure to diverse viewpoints, provide better coverage of a variety of cultures, and provide better textual cohesion and opportunities for critical thinking and decision making. They also recommended that texts place greater emphasis on explaining important processes and less on memorization of facts. Other critiques of social studies texts made by Tyson-Bernstein (1988) and Woodward (1987)

faulted the books for covering too many topics and treating each superficially; lacking of cohesion and depth; lacking context needed to make facts meaningful; and not fully integrating information on minorities and women.

After examining a number of social studies textbooks, Beck and McKeown (1991) pointed out that the two most general problematic features of these textbooks were: they assume an unrealistic level of background knowledge on the part of the students; and the presentations of information lack coherence. As an example of not providing enough background knowledge, they explained that students are expected to understand such concepts as "representative government" on their own. With regard to the lack of coherence, the authors noted that geographic information is often presented as lists of features with little if any attempt to show how such features affect the lives of the indigenous populations, for instance. The authors recommended that teachers build depth of knowledge on main topics through a variety of means, including using tradebooks and historical documents and considering events from multiple perspectives.

In an earlier study, Beck, McKeown and Gromoll (1989) examined four popular social studies textbooks and found a wide range of topics covered in list-like fashion. Further, the texts lacked explicitly drawn relationships of cause and effect between important facts or they failed to make explicit the relative importance of the facts and events presented. The authors noted the importance of explicitly stating goals for each section and recommended that textbooks use a causal/explanatory style to draw inferences and connect facts for the student. Warren and Roseberry (1989) similarly looked at several high school textbooks and found narratives devoid of any unifying structure save a chronological one. They faulted the textbooks for failing to bring students into contact with "concrete historical realities, problems, and models through consideration of documentary and secondary source materials."

Social studies and reading comprehension

To help students understand their social studies texts, Schneider and McGee Brown (1980) suggested a three-phase strategy: 1) motivating students, assessing skills, and diagnosing needs

prior to reading; 2) guiding students to seek out information and comprehend and intellectually interact with the content during the reading; and 3) reinforcing, reflecting and applying knowledge after reading. In the pre-reading phase, the authors recommended providing students with a graphic depiction (e.g., semantic web or audiotape) of the main ideas, events, people that they will encounter in the reading. During the reading phase, teachers should include a variety of study guides to be done as individual classwork or at home to promote construction of meaning from texts and organization of content. One such aid is a *pattern guide*, meant to alert the reader to the structure of the text, which may include identifying specific vocabulary that signals common text patterns (e.g., "as a result" signals a cause and effect pattern). In the post-reading phase, teachers should engage in activities that help "enrich meanings students associate with major concepts" by broadening important associations and definitions.

Turner (1980) identified some difficulties that less able readers have using social studies textbooks, such as weak literacy skills (i.e., reading and writing skills) compared to speaking and listening skills; problems understanding questions; lack of paraphrasing ability; lack of skills in reading and interpreting charts, maps and tables; insufficient textbook skills (e.g., using the glossary and indices); undeveloped or nonexistent skimming and scanning skills; and lack of concentration when reading long passages. Turner suggested that teachers attempt to diagnose these problem areas, instruct students in particular skills needed and allow them to practice the skills in order to increase the effectiveness of the textbook learning experience. Activities that provide visual and other sensory means for comprehending abstract concepts, and tasks that allow the student to clarify and manipulate difficult content are considered essential for helping readers with difficulties.

Building on schema theory and metacognitive theory, Idol (1987) used a critical thinking map (graphic organizer) with remedial reading students that required the students to think about the important ideas and events in the text, draw conclusions, and make connections to prior experience or knowledge. Her results showed increased comprehension of reading passages among these students and continued use of reading strategies even after the organizer was no longer used. A

study by Armbruster, Anderson and Meyer (1990) also showed that students that had engaged in text framing activities outperformed in reading comprehension those students who had not used them.

Franklin and Roach (1992) found that upper elementary school students often have difficulty transitioning from learning-to-read to reading-to-learn. With limited exposure to anything but narrative texts, these students benefited from the use of metacognitive strategies, such as the use of organizers, to familiarize themselves with text structures, extract meaning from reading content, and take control over their own learning. Franklin and Roach presented findings which showed how teacher guidance while examining a text, attention to signal words (e.g., *first, then, months later*), use of graphic organizers, and summary writing could improve students reading comprehension skills as well as their level of confidence for making sense of content texts. Alverman (1987) also advocated strategic teaching of social studies, using specific techniques such as vocabulary overviews, prediction guides and graphic organizers.

Drum (1984) looked at textual characteristics and the ability of students of different ability levels and ages to comprehend written texts. She concluded that, across age levels, difficult content proved to be a more formidable barrier to comprehension than unfamiliar text structure. Drum recommended that difficult content be framed within text structures familiar to the students and, likewise, new or difficult structures should be introduced with familiar content. Looking at ESL students' ability to identify major events and correctly sequence events, Carrell (1987) corroborated Drum's findings. Carrell found that texts vary in difficulty based on a combination of form and content. From easiest to most difficult for comprehension, the hierarchy was found to be: familiar form/familiar content; unfamiliar form/familiar content; familiar form/unfamiliar content; unfamiliar form/unfamiliar content.

Dreher, Singer, and Letteer (1986) discussed "explicitness" as a factor in text comprehensibility. They identify five aspects of explicitness which help clarify the "significance and relevance of facts and relationships": 1) providing reasons for functions and events; 2) clearly defining new terms; 3) clarifying new ideas by using examples, analogies, and figurative language;

4) helping students activate prior knowledge; 5) using short direct sentences; and 6) orienting readers to central ideas.

Research conducted by Meyer (1984) with mostly ninth grade students found that explicitly teaching about text structure and showing students how to map the structure of a text can have positive results on reading comprehension. Studies with eighth-graders (Armbruster and Anderson, 1980) and with adults (Dansereau, et al., 1979) found that recall and comprehension improved after instruction in "mapping" or "networking" techniques. Such techniques helped students decide what was important to remember and gave them a "conceptual structure for initially interrelating these ideas" (Meyer, 1984). Bartolome (1994) also recommended using frames and graphic organizers to explicitly teach text structures and other elements of academic genres to culturally diverse students.

Social studies and writing

A study done by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) found a connection between effective writing and development of critical thinking skills (Applebee, Langer and Mullis, 1986). The NAEP study also observed that students who write more, write better. Risinger (1987, 1992) suggested that the best approach for integrating writing and critical thinking skills would be through writing assignments that "stimulate and challenge students," such as reporting, exposition, narration, and argumentation, and pointed out that writing is one of the best ways to approach content matter in-depth. Finally, in a meta-analysis of research on students' experience of the curriculum by Erickson and Shultz (1991), it was found that the fields of literacy and writing provide the clearest focus on how students engage with the curriculum, since writing reflects individual personalities of the authors.

Social studies and critical thinking

Goodlad's nationwide study of schooling found little critical thinking being done in the curriculum (Goodlad, 1984). In the decade since his study, more critical thinking skills and

activities have been included in social studies texts. Patrick (1986) recommended that subject matter and cognitive strategies and skills be integrated in order to create effective lessons. These skills should be practiced extensively and systematically during social studies instruction and in "a manner that is consistent with their cognitive development and prior learning experiences."

Greenleaf and Warshauer Freedman (1993) illustrated one means of implementing such an instructional approach. They identified an *Orientation-Solution-Connection* discourse pattern that presented the students with a problem, then elicited remedies that resulted in a solution, with the teacher finally making a connection between the solution and the larger lesson to be learned and applied in the future activities. Such an approach may take place in a typical recitation discourse model, but if it is focused on the solution of a problem and encourages student participation, the approach allows for student input and expression while using higher-level thinking skills.

Multiculturalism in social studies curricula

Thorton (1994) observed that conservative educators and researchers have favored an emphasis on the development of democracy and Western-based history, while multiculturalists tend to advance the incorporation of multiple perspectives and inclusion of "non-privileged" persons. Proponents of citizenship transmission and, to a lesser extent, the social science model "have tended to adopt...mainstream (in contrast to transformative) approaches to perspective taking and inclusion."

The National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (1989) recommended that other cultures be taught in social studies classes and that connections with other societies in their regions be treated as well. The commission also endorsed teaching about world religions from the perspective of the believers, so as to paint a realistic rather than an exotic picture of other world views. However, a study of ten frequently used eighth-grade U. S. history textbooks by the Michigan Board of Education (1984) concluded that commonly used texts contained a large number of deficiencies with regard to their treatment of minority groups such as Native Americans

and Hispanics. They also found that international aspects of U.S. history were very poorly dealt with and that references to other cultures and countries were "weak and frequently distorted."

Bernstein Cohen (1986) advocated for the inclusion of education about ethnic diversity throughout the social studies curriculum, from American history to government, and at every grade level. She highlighted studies that have shown that "the more children understand about stereotyping, the less negativism they will have toward other groups." She added that protection of minority rights is at the core of the American political system. To effectively teach about ethnic diversity, teachers should present unbiased examinations of alternative interpretations of events; compare and contrast different ethnic groups; encourage group activities in ethnically diverse classrooms; and use community resources, such as oral and local histories, family records, and community studies. Beck and McKeown (1991), in their research on social studies texts, recommended that important social and political events in history be viewed from multiple perspectives as a means of bringing depth to the learning of history.

Alleman and Brophy (1991) studied homework assignments and their effects on students and teachers. They recommend homework assignments that tap students as cultural resources, permit students to make connections between classroom learning and their own experiences, and that encourage students to use their culturally diverse families and communities as resources for learning. Homework should provide activities for learning which are not easily done in the classroom and that are relevant to the students' lives outside of the classroom.

Implications for social studies curriculum development with English language learners

Looking at how students interact with the curriculum, Erickson and Shultz (1991) concluded that variation in student experience is more diverse than previously believed and that educators on the whole have not focused on that variation. Student comfort with the social participation structure of an academic task, for instance, can vary according to culturally learned

assumptions about appropriateness in communication and in social relationships, individual personality, and power relations in the classroom social system and in society at large.

With regard to pedagogical strategies for effectively dealing with culturally diverse students, Bartolome (1994) stated that to engage in "culturally responsive teaching" teachers need to employ strategies that "recognize and build on culturally different ways of learning, behaving and using language." Tikunoff (1983) found that "the use of information from the LEP students' home culture can promote engagement in instructional tasks and contribute to a feeling of trust between children and teachers." Further, the study identified three ways in which home and community culture could be incorporated into classrooms that aided in achieving students' "maximum attention" to the instructional task at hand: 1) using cultural referents to convey instructional and institutional requests; 2) incorporating into the instruction the rules of discourse from the home language; and 3) respecting the values and norms of the home culture equally with those of the school.

In a meta-analysis of research on cooperative learning, Cohen (1994) found that the effects of "status" must be modified in order to maximize the productivity of cooperative learning. To encourage the same level of activity for "low-status" students as for "high-status" students, Cohen recommends using "multiple ability treatment," a strategy by the which the teachers attempts to convince the class that each individual has special talents that can be of use to the group. She warns, however, that teachers should avoid making race, ethnicity or gender the basis for group formation, since it can be counter-productive to the teacher's social goals. Cohen also strongly suggests that students be "pre-trained" for group work and "processed," or monitored, while engaging in group activities in order to enhance the productivity of groups.

Discourse Analysis of Classroom Interactions

Discourse analysis, or the study of language in use, has been a growing area of research for over thirty years. Its development has been influenced by a number of different fields of language study, including descriptive linguistics, sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, semiotics, pragmatics, and anthropology. Zeller Harris is regularly credited for initiating analysis of discourse above the sentence-level in his 1952 paper, "Discourse Analysis" (as cited in Brown & Yule, 1983; McCarthy, 1991; and Pennycock, 1993). Work in discourse analysis has moved in many directions since that time beginning with a great deal of research conducted on speakers acquiring and using their native language in the 1960's and moving into second and foreign language learning situations in the 1970's.

Although discourse analysis studies have been conducted in all settings where language is used (e.g., schools, workplaces, social events, doctors' offices) and with a variety of linguistic texts (e.g., transcripts of oral discourse, textbook passages, student compositions, popular media), this research project was concerned with classroom discourse, specifically spoken interaction among teachers and students in second language learning environments. The literature review, however, drew from multiple sources to provide a picture of the language these secondary English language learners (ELLs) must acquire in order to succeed in their academic coursework.

This review begins by describing the range of work in discourse analysis previously conducted and then moves on to examine spoken classroom discourse and what we can learn about students' language learning and social interaction in first language and foreign/second language settings. The discussion next focuses on some cultural dimensions of communication, language learning, and discourse styles, and finally, draws implications for teaching and learning in secondary second language classrooms where students are learning English.

The view of discourse analysis, as considered in this paper, is drawn from remarks given by Barnes (1974):

> The study of linguistic phenomena in school settings should seek to answer educational questions. We are interested in linguistic forms only insofar as through them we can gain insight into the social events of the classroom and thereby our understandings which students achieve. Our interest is in the social contexts of cognition: speech unites the cognitive and the

> social...In order to learn, students must use what they already know so as to give meaning to what the teacher presents to them... (as cited in Cazden, 1988, p. 2)

Although Barnes' remarks are geared to a teacher-centered, transmission model, his point that language creates a social context for interaction has value. It can be applied to classrooms where there is co-construction of knowledge–all interlocuters benefit from bottom-up processing, whereby they interpret what they hear according to knowledge and experiences they already have, as well as from top-down processing, where they examine the forms of language spoken in conversation. Discourse analysis of these two processes, along with conversation management strategies, such as requesting clarification and negotiating for meaning, permits a researcher to explore how students comprehend and participate in spoken interactions.

Language learning

Early research in language learning utilized discourse analysis to explore second language acquisition theory. As mentioned in above discussions on the focus of participants in classroom discourse, researchers have looked at intrapersonal language learning, including how students acquire certain forms of the language (morphemes, phonemes, vocabulary, sentence structure); where their developing proficiency might be placed along a continuum of interlanguage (e.g., how much of their first or second language have they acquired as they move towards full proficiency, where they may have fossilized); and what errors they make in using language. Other researchers have studied interpersonal language use, such as what functions people use in natural settings and how they may best be taught in the classroom; and how people interpret gestures and other forms of non-verbal communication (and/or add them into their own repertoire) (Larsen-Freeman, 1993).

Looking at the social context of language use, many scholars, such as Vygotsky (1978), assert that students' language learning is promoted through social interaction and contextualized communication. With teacher facilitation, students can construct meaning from texts and classroom discourse and can be assisted to understand complex concepts. Tharp and Gallimore's work on instructional conversation exemplify this approach, viewing the teacher as a "capable other" (1988). Other researchers have found that student-student discourse is also a rich source of

language learning (Fisher, 1993; Floriani, 1994; Heras, 1994; Lin, 1994). This dimension of research will be discussed in more detail in the third section of this paper.

Swain (1985), Pica (1987), and Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler (1989), among others, have examined the negotiation of language input and language output, looking at the communicative value as well as the comprehensibility. Swain (1985) has paid more attention to linguistic forms, yet she recommends that students practice and receive feedback on reading and writing activities. Pica and colleagues (1987, 1989) have conducted experimental and classroom-based research on spoken interaction between native speakers (teachers and students) and non-native speakers (English language learners) while they conduct communicative tasks. Their research was more functionally aligned and looked at how non-native speakers (NNS) modify their utterances to make them more comprehensible. They were interested in discovering which linguistic cues from native speakers would enable non-native speakers to develop communicative competence.

Content learning

After looking at the focus of the discourse analysis, the methods for conducting research, the players in the spoken interaction, and language learning that takes place, it is time to turn to the content of the communication, which is, in part, determined by the type of classroom. A large number of studies have been conducted in second and foreign language learning situations. But in more recent years, studies of the language issues involved in content learning have received attention.

Some researchers have turned their attention to analyzing the linguistic demands of individual content areas. Halliday's (1975) work was instrumental in focusing a linguistic lens on subject-specific registers. Unlike Cazden's (1988) and Michaels and Collins' (1984) concern with communication style (e.g., use of a topic-centered versus episodic narrative pattern), Halliday looked at formal mathematics discourse norms. His work identified the prevailing technical vocabulary and patterns of discourse for mathematics. For instance, the formal discourse of math

dictates heavy use of passive voice, lexical density (e.g., least common multiple, greatest common denominator), and highly marked grammatical structures (e.g., *Given* three consecutive even integers, *find the sum such that* the product of the first two *is three times* the third.). Halliday recommends introducing students to the mathematics register and teaching them to use it as a second language.

In an effort to further explicate Halliday's ideas and apply them to mathematics instruction for English language learners, Spanos, Rhodes, Dale and Crandall (1988) analyzed the use of math language in beginning algebra classes in community colleges with native and non-native English speakers. They audiotaped and then analyzed the transcripts of small student groups as they talked through problem-solving protocols. Their research resulted in a classification framework of semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic features of the mathematics register. This work has provided guidance to teachers of ELLs as to the areas of math language where explicit instruction is needed. For instance, the frequent use of similar terms that differ by only a preposition (e.g., divided *into* versus divided *by*) pose comprehension problems for many English language learners. Spanos and colleagues recommended direct teaching and practice with the algebraic language, separate from computation and problem-solving activities.

Content area language registers have been identified in science as well. When Halliday (1989) examined scientific language, he concluded that the "'jargon'... has the effect of making the learner feel excluded and alienated from the subject-matter" (p. 1). He explored the difficulties of scientific English through seven categories[1] that express the complex relationships among technical terms. Lemke (1990) focused on the scientific style of talk, explaining that "scientific language has a preference in its grammar for using the passive voice...people tend to disappear from science as actors or agents...[and there is] a grammatical preference for using abstract nouns derived from verbs" (p. 130). Lemke criticized these stylistic norms for rendering science less accessible and less engaging to students. "(T)eachers tend to leave much of the semantics and grammar of scientific language completely implicit" (p. 170). Instead, he argued, teachers should use

[1] These are: interlocking definitions, technical taxonomies, special expressions, lexical density, syntactic ambiguity, grammatical metaphor, and semantic discontinuity (p. 3).

metadiscourse (talk directly with students about scientific talk), introduce semantic relationships among scientific terms, and give students more practice in speaking about science. He recommended using colloquial speech initially so students understand the lexicon and concepts being taught, and later teaching them the necessary technical terms, grammatical expressions, and discourse patterns, such as use of argumentation. Warren and Rosebery (1995) have conducted more recent research on how a collaborative inquiry approach can lead English language learners to use argumentation successfully in science class.

Snow, Met and Genesee (1989) considered subject areas in general as they distinguished between "content-obligatory" language and "content-compatible" language within the framework of a content course: language that is obligatory for understanding the material taught in a content course, such as technical terms like "evaporate" and "condense" in Physical Science, compared to language that is non-obligatory but compatible with language objectives developed in the ESL curriculum, and could be taught in the science course, such as "if-then" structures and "because" clauses. They pointed out students must learn content obligatory language in order to master the material in a course. Content-compatible language, however, may be used across various subject disciplines.

Coelho (1982) also examined several content areas, specifically linguistic features of geography, history, and science in textbooks, teacher and media presentations, and assignments that fostered cohesion of the intended message. She found that certain linguistic signals cued students to time references and organizing structures, such as cause-effect, comparison-contrast, and generalization-example. These signals included verb tenses and conditions, expressions of time, rhetorical markers such as temporal phrases, conjunctions, and causative words (e.g., as a result, so). She recommended that students be taught to recognize these cues and understand their functions in order to improve reading. By extension, it is reasonable to assume that student spoken interaction (particularly listening comprehension) can improve as well with attention to these linguistic signals.

Rather than creating typologies of scientific language or focusing on specific linguistic forms, Prophet and Dow (1994) looked at the influence of language on learning content. They conducted an experiment with secondary students in Botswana science classes to determine if the medium of instruction had a significant effect on the students' attainment of astronomy concepts. They explored the theory that, "...given the abstract nature of many science concepts...the only reasonable way that ideas can be approached is through the medium of language; descriptive, instructional or otherwise" (p. 206) and cited earlier research that showed students' verbal participation in science activities, such as reporting observations or demonstrating knowledge, increased if they spoke in their native vernacular. In two different secondary grade-levels (Form One and Form Three), some students studied concepts in English, others in Setswana; a third control group studied a health lesson. The researchers found that students taught in Setswana at Form One performed significantly better than those taught in English. For Form Three, the Setswana group performed slightly better, but not significantly so. However, when looking at all students, Prophet and Dow found that the responses for the Setswana group "were often longer and on translation were found to be more descriptive, more grammatically correct and conceptually more complex" (p. 214). Their research adds support to the debate about using the native language in English-medium classrooms; more and more linguistic educators recognize the value (and expediency) of native language use, especially in promoting conceptual development, although they argue technical language and discourse styles in English must later be taught (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1994; Lemke, 1990).

Classroom culture

Finally, spoken interaction is shaped by the classroom culture. Although this topic will be developed further below, to show the relationship of the classroom culture to home-school-community communicative patterns and cultural norms, several points about the role of power in the classroom will be made here.

One important concept concerns the power that language asserts in the classroom. Those who have conducted critical discourse analyses have pointed out that those who are minority language speakers (i.e., do not speak the majority language of a society) are often at a disadvantage in society. The concepts they desire to speak about may be more difficult to express when their non-native language must be used, and without meaningful and communicative langauge teaching, they will not reach full proficiency in the majority language. Consequently, their "rise" in society may be suppressed. (See Auerbach, 1992 for an interpretation Paolo Friere's work in this area).

This notion has particular implications when students are at beginning and intermediate levels of proficiency in English. Since teachers generally control the language use in the classroom (through language choice, turn nominations, topic selection, and questioning patterns), they hold the power. Students do not have many options for language choice and thus are relegated to demonstrating knowledge through an imprecise manner. (See Short, 1993 for a discussion of the difficulties in assessing student's content knowledge through their second language.) To help enhance the control students can exert over classroom discourse, some researchers advocate teaching students topic management strategies and the use of formulaic language and directives. In addition, it is highly recommended that students be socialized to the classroom routines (Cazden, 1988; Heath, 1978; Kramsch, 1985; McCarthy, 1991). Other researchers, as mentioned, recommended using the students' native languages for conceptual development with related lessons for learning about the English used in the content areas (Cummins, 1981; Lemke, 1990; Prophet & Dow, 1992).

Another opportunity for shifting the balance of power is offered in the work of Moll and colleagues (Moll, 1992; Gonzalez, et al., 1993). Participating teachers in their research are trained as ethnographers who enter student homes to observe and identify the "funds of knowledge" that exist within. Teachers use this information as a basis for curriculum development on topics such as animal husbandry, medicinal plants, and marketing. The knowledge that is being shared, therefore, is not what the teacher thinks is important, but what is generated in the students' households and which is part of their everyday experiences.

Classroom interactions

For English language learners, the classroom can be a successful and supportive learning environment. By engaging in meaningful social interactions, learners can discover the linguistic and sociolinguistic rules associated with comprehending and producing the language. How classroom discourse can be constructed and manipulated to foster language learning is described below. In particular, patterns of interaction that exist in classrooms and their influence on student participation and language learning; negotiation of input and output by students and/or teachers to enhance language learning and develop communicative competence; and joint construction of knowledge that students and teachers accomplish through language are addressed.

Patterns of Interaction

Patterns of interaction in classroom talk include, in part, quasi-rigid rules about speaking (at least in transmission model classrooms). As Heath (1978) noted, most classroom discourse rules are governed by the teacher. Students need to learn that verbal and non-verbal signals as well as the absence of signals can be used by teachers to control discourse. Mehan (1979) and Cazden (1988), as discussed previously, identified turn-taking and topic selection procedures in the classroom. They both found that most of the time teachers control the nomination process which allows students to speak in class. This process is the lynchpin of the IRE discourse pattern (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Further, there appeared to be clear demarcations as to when the IRE and TRS patterns occur, including verbal and intonation signals. By capitalizing on the kinesic, verbal, and paralinguistic markers that indicate the beginning and closing of a TRS, Cazden and Mehan posit, students can get the floor and initiate conversational topics in those slots. Students therefore can learn where their comments should be placed in order to get the best "response" to trigger a discussion on their interests.

Lin (1994) also looked at oral discourse patterns that revealed topic shifts and found an array of markers used by teachers: verbal (e.g., "Okay") and non-verbal signals (e.g., writing a

student response on an overhead transparency if it was accepted as "correct"), restructuring of the physical space (e.g., moving desks into cooperative group formats for a new activity), and other visual cues. The teacher, through her actions and oral comments, indicated clearly to students what was valued and appropriate in the classroom for the academic work and social setting. "...(S)he provided specific information to insure that students knew what to do, how, when, in what ways, for what purpose" (p. 389). However, not all of the teacher's rules for discourse in a classroom were made explicit to the students. As a result, ELLs might have more difficulty in being socialized to the setting if they do not know how to interpret the non-verbal and representational signals.

In her ethnomethodological study, Ernst (1994) revealed the influence of sociolinguistic rules in classroom discourse. She conducted research on a "talking circle," a regular activity in an elementary classroom with English language learners. The purpose of the talking circle, according to the teacher, was "to assist LEP students in the development of language conversational forms by exchanging and requesting information, asking and answering questions, and elaborating and repairing oral discourse" (p. 299). One level of analysis that Ernst performed considered patterns of interaction within the talking circle structure. She identified the social demands of participating and the rules and expectations for getting the floor and speaking, specifically who can speak for how long, about what, when, and with what outcome. Ernst found that the manner in which a speaker was selected (or acknowledged) depended on the phase of the talking circle. In early phases, the teacher or the students initiated topics for discussion. During these phases, the teacher would support students' conversational contributions. In the middle phase, a single topic and speaker (a student) held the floor for a sustained period of time. At this point, the student had ownership of the topic being discussed and the teacher would encourage him/her to speak freely. In the latter phases, the teacher took control to present information to the students. "Because she [the teacher] has to cover a fairly large amount of information, opportunities for students to share some of the responsibility for generating the topic for discussion are constrained" (p. 303). Ernst concluded that to participate appropriately, students needed not only to have something to say, but

they needed to know the sociolinguistic and participatory rules for speaking, according to the phase of the talking circle.

Other patterns of interaction present in classroom discourse concern classroom routines. Language expressions associated with repeated, routinized activities, should be taught to students. By becoming familiar with routines and the formulaic speech associated with them, students automatize the linguistic demands those routines impose (Cazden, 1988; McLaughlin, 1987). As a result, English language learners can, for instance, respond to a teacher inquiry such as "take out your homework" non-verbally, by placing the assignment on their desks. As Cazden (1988) explained, "One benefit of a clear and consistent event structure is that it allows participants to attend to content rather than procedure" (p. 47). This is a key consideration for ELLs who are unaccustomed to routinized classroom activities and unfamiliar with the language used to trigger those routines.

For similar reasons, Kramsch (1985) recommended discourse management strategies and formulae be explicitly taught, beyond the sentence level of instruction. These included strategies (and contextual knowledge) for steering a conversation, evaluating production, checking comprehension, stalling(e.g., fillers, echo pairs), and using affective functions (e.g., Isn't that great!). McCarthy (1991) concurred, taking the position that by helping students with formulaic speech and marking features (e.g., for changing topics, interrupting, closings), teachers provide students with tools to organize and manage conversation and narrative.

Negotiation of input and output

The negotiation of input and output has been the focus of a number of studies with second language learners. The negotiation process is closely linked in the literature to communicative competence; however, in a classroom setting, this competence is more specialized in that it frequently revolves around academic topics of which students rarely have first-hand knowledge or even background schema to bring to the negotiation process. Yet, as students attempt to learn the content material through language negotiation strategies, they strengthen their language learning.

Despite the unequal power status that exists among teachers and students, as manifested through classroom norms for turn-taking, topic selection, and such, a social relationship needs to be established whereby each participant in the discourse fulfills the obligation of maintaining the flow of conversation, modifying and restructuring comments to permit an interlocutor's comprehension (Pica, 1987).

Pica (1987) looked at classroom transcript data to identify the comprehension checks and clarification requests used in second language classrooms that enhance language comprehension and production. Through data that represented non-native and native speaker interaction, Pica showed how a non-native speaker could signal a native speaker that the linguistic material was too difficult for his/her comprehension and could request assistance. Similarly, the data revealed ways that a native speaker could ask the non-native speaker to clarify an utterance (e.g., to repair pronunciation error or replace an inappropriate lexical item). Pica pointed out, although there was no direct evidence that:

> the immediate comprehension and production gains experienced as a result of interactional restructuring generalize to the learner's interlanguage repertoire, i.e., lead directly to acquisition, there is a great deal of indirect evidence and convincing theoretical claims to support the contributions of interactional modification moves to the acquisition process and to encourage their use by classroom participants" (p. 8).

However, Pica also showed that the unequal status of teacher and student in the classroom often inhibited the social negotiation of meaning. She found that at times teachers over-accommodated (e.g., they gave the correct answer or corrected student errors without letting students check for comprehension or provide clarification). In other instances, restructuring of social interaction (through confirmation or comprehension checks, clarification requests) did not occur because: a) teachers felt it would interrupt the lesson flow; b) it was not needed because the material was presented at or below comprehension level; or c) teachers (or students conditioned to view teachers as experts) interpreted comprehension check and clarification questions as challenges.

In a later study (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989) the researchers found that non-native speakers would modify their output if signaled to do so, most often when the signal was a request for clarification rather than a confirmation check. Although an information-gap task–

where the non-native speaker held all the information needed to complete the task and the native speaker had to elicit it–offered the best opportunity for the non-native speaker to modify his/her output, the use of a particular signal and the subsequent modification was not significantly affected by the type of task. The researchers concluded that "...comprehensible output...was very much an outcome of linguistic demands placed on the non-native speaker by the native speaker in the course of their negotiated interaction" (p. 83).

Floriani's (1994) work on negotiation of both input and output examined the construction of oral and written texts in the classroom and the relationships between them. This study was conducted in a 6th grade bilingual classroom and analyzed face-to-face interaction of student pairs for content and patterns of the talk, looking for constraints and supports to composing written text. It showed how oral texts influence the patterns of negotiation that the students establish and how these patterns influence the written text they produce. In this class, students were able to talk through a text with a partner and create a written text that had been negotiated through social interaction over a period of time. Floriani found that a dynamic process occurred as students talked about their texts, wrote, reflected, talked more, and so on. She probed deeper, however, into the factors that influenced the successful completion of the task. The study revealed that the more time student pairs spent working together and jointly creating shared knowledge and expectations about roles prior to this particular assignment, the better the written text would be (i.e., richer in detail, easier to write). Students who had a history of working together (even in a group rather than specifically in the same pair) required less negotiation about their roles in performing the task. They negotiated roles first and then worked on the text, negotiating the content in a straightforward manner. Students without a shared group history had more difficulty. Their negotiation of roles and development of a working relationship co-occurred while they were negotiating the text content and consequently interfered with the writing process.

Although Fisher's (1993) study of primary students working on a computer-based task, did not involve English language learners, her findings are worth considering here. Through analysis of transcripts where students negotiated a task through social interaction, Fisher (1993)

identified three types of talk that resulted from pupil-pupil interaction: *disputational* (an initiation by a student is challenged, but not clearly resolved), *cumulative* (an initiation is accepted without challenge, comment, or amendment) and *exploratory* (an initiation may be challenged with additional or other suggestions leading to acceptance of the initiation, the suggestion, or further modification). During exploratory talk, students asked questions to solve problems or find out information; they jointly constructed meaning through spoken interaction, explained their comments and ideas, and did not close debate or discussion early. Fisher concluded that exploratory talk had more "potential for learning" (p. 255) and that teachers should teach exploratory discourse strategies explicitly and create contexts "in which a *requirement* for discursive problem-solving is apparent to the pupils" (p. 256).

Joint construction of knowledge

Several of the research studies already considered under other areas of classroom interaction reappear under this heading. That fact indicates the strong overlap and interrelationship among categories, be they patterns of interaction, sociolinguistic rules for classroom talk, roles of the participants, or negotiation of meaning. As is becoming increasingly clear, classroom discourse is a very complex phenomenon and students are not able, nor should be expected to, master the norms and behaviors associated with classroom discourse quickly.

Much of the recent research described in the literature that has examined how students and teachers jointly construct meaning has been influenced by the work of Vygotsky (1978). From his theoretical perspective, social interaction and contextualized communication are necessary conditions for student learning. This learning may be related to an academic topic like biology or to a language system like English. Guided teacher assistance helps students become socialized to the academic discourse setting. As discussed earlier, Tharp and Gallimore's (1988) work on instructional conversation has developed from a Vygotskian base. They asserted that through dialogue that targets an instructional goal, teachers can move students from their current level of knowledge to a higher plane. By asking fewer factual recall questions and more information

questions; by allowing students more freedom to self-select turns; by connecting and building on student discourse (either by the teacher or another student), and by promoting student use of more complex language, teachers help students acquire and practice academic discourse.

One of the interesting questions of Lin's (1994) research was concerned with "how academic and social knowledge is constructed over time through the discursive and social practices in classrooms" (p. 372). The time element adds a new dimension to some of the studies and findings examined so far. Lin's observations, which began the first day of class in a new school year revealed the ways in which the teacher and students created their roles, established relationships as readers and writers, and set the stage for activities that would occur later in the year. This "across time" analysis showed how the teacher "consciously and systematically helped students construct a range of intertextual relationships among events that supported particular ways of engaging with texts, communicating with others, and constructing text" (p. 396). Beginning early in the year with developing of individual and group goals, the teacher also introduced her students to ways of presenting information, topics that were appropriate for the class, and ways of behaving as a teacher, student or group member.

Heras (1994) also considered the "across time" construction of meaning as students in her study participated in a long-term social studies project. Despite the institutional roles assigned to them, the teacher and students negotiated the type of interaction (and thus the roles) they would engage in. Over time, with the teacher's input, the students constructed their roles as historians and anthropologists. They then gathered data and worked with it in groups, jointly constructing their projects, writing the history of the life of an imaginary island. In Floriani's (1994) study, students were also engaged in creating a written text through talk. Floriani not only focused on the negotiation of input and output performed by the student pairs, but also the process by which they jointly constructed meaning and displayed this meaning through text. It appeared, in this case, that successful negotiation led to joint construction of knowledge. Those students in her study who were unable to negotiate their roles and decide what content to use in their text, did not construct shared knowledge.

As will be seen in the next section, joint construction of knowledge depends, in part, on shared cultural norms and patterns of communication. If students and teachers do not enter the classroom with these shared expectations for communication, learning might be inhibited, unless they create a composite culture and agreed upon the patterns of communication and interaction that will take place.

Cultural Dimensions of Communication and Discourse Styles

It is important to study the culture of a classroom as well as the cultures of the participants when analyzing discourse in schools. Culture reflects the patterns of behavior (actions) and the patterns for behavior (expectations and meanings) that are shared within a community. The personal culture of each participant in a classroom and the learned social norms of spoken interaction are part of the context in which language is used. Culture is not static though; rather, it can be co-constructed by the individuals within a community and can change according to the context. It is therefore possible that despite different home discourse patterns and cultural styles of communication, teachers and students can actively create a composite culture in the classroom suited to all parties (Eriks-Brophy & Crago, 1994; Jordan, 1992).

This process of co-construction, which is grounded in joint negotiation of meaning, does not occur very often in classrooms, however. In most instances, one culture prevails in a classroom–that of the teacher. Since most teachers are from middle-class backgrounds (Zeichner, 1993), their cultures inevitably differ from those of most English language learners. If students are unfamiliar with the teacher's or school's culture, they are at a clear disadvantage when it comes to participating in class and learning through spoken interaction. Zeichner explains that when teachers are unfamiliar with their students' cultures, they hold negative expectations for students or interpret their interaction patterns (e.g., eye contact, self-nomination to talk, small group behavior) inaccurately. This explanation was illuminated in the "sharing time" research, when teachers expressed dissatisfaction with students' episodic narrative styles, a narrative style that did not

correspond to the cultural communication pattern of the teachers (Cazden, 1988; Michaels & Collins, 1984).

Students' cultures can influence not only their communication styles, but also their involvement in class, learning styles, and the value they place on education (Nieto, 1992; Philips, 1983). Heath (1978) explained that most classroom rules may be unfamiliar to culturally diverse students. Teachers, therefore, need to reflect on the appropriateness of each rule for their students and then spend time explaining the rules and expectations for behavior. Heath (1983) also looked at literacy practices in three different communities and drew conclusions as to which ones might facilitate success in elementary classrooms, based on the instructional style prevalent in those educational settings. Students from middle class backgrounds, where, for instance, parents read stories to their children and asked comprehension questions, made the easiest transition to school. Heath's work was of critical importance for educators because it demonstrated that speakers of varieties of English (in this case Appalachian English) bring language resources with them to school, although their discourse patterns differed from those used in the academic setting. Teachers, Heath advocated, need to learn ways to tap into the students' knowledge and use it as a foundation for more traditional (i.e., "academic") literacy and oralcy practices in the classroom.

Many researchers who have examined cultural differences have suggested or implemented interventions to try to match certain aspects of the two cultures more closely in the classroom. Jordan (1992) and Vogt and colleagues (1993), for example, described work they conducted with Hawaiian children and Navajo children, respectively. After studying aspects of Hawaiian discourse patterns and caretaking responsibilities, educators and researchers at the Kamehameha schools prepared a reading program that would incorporate some of the cultural practices they found in the home community and were able to create a successful hybrid classroom culture (Jordan, 1992). When several researchers imported these reading practices (which were associated with specific classroom organizational structures) to a Navajo school in Arizona, they realized that different accommodations would be needed to suit the cultural learning and interaction patterns of the Navajo children. By restructuring their program to separate children by gender and into smaller

learning groups, as preferred by Navajo children, oral participation and reading proficiency levels increased (Vogt, Jordan & Tharp, 1993).

Philips (1983, 1972) in her work with Warm Springs Indian students likewise found that the classroom culture, with the preferred interaction and participation styles established by an Anglo teacher, did not match the interaction and conversation styles the students were familiar with at home. By using ethnographic methods, she observed and recorded interaction patterns in an academic setting and compared those with the cultural norms. At school, the Indian children spoke less than the Anglo students in "official" classroom discourse segments of the lesson; they made less effort to "get the floor" (although they bid for the attention of their peers through talk); and they did not seem to listen as attentively as Anglo students during lessons. Teachers evaluated Warm Springs Indian student responses negatively more often than the Anglo student responses and reprimanded Indian students more frequently for not paying attention. Philips was able to demonstrate that in the Warm Springs Indian culture, Indians often speak to a general audience rather than a single individual; a response is not required to every statement by another person; and individuals control their own turn-taking (as opposed to a teacher selecting turns for class members). Thus, a direct conflict existed between the way children were taught to behave in conversation at home and the way the school expected them to behave. Philips concluded that teachers need to understand cultural communication patterns and factor differences into their expectations of students as well as into their instructional demands and directions. She found, for instance, that Indian students participated the most when the teacher established small group activities that the students ran themselves. Students could be taught different communication and interaction patterns to use, Philips pointed out, but such teaching must be done explicitly.

Eriks-Brophy and Crago (1994) conducted an interesting study with Inuit children in classes taught by Inuit teachers, those who had first-hand knowledge of the culture and communication patterns of the community. The researchers collected data on the teachers' use of initiation acts, turn allocations, and IRE routines and compared their findings with those of Mehan (1979) who collected his data in mainstream, English-speaking classrooms. Eriks-Brophy and

Crago (1994) found that the Inuit teachers were able to "transmit learning in more culturally congruous ways" (p.106). Inuit teachers rarely nominated students to reply (singling out students was antithetical to the culture), they did not structure their discourse around the IRE pattern, rarely offered overt evaluation of student utterances, and relied heavily on peer models. The researchers attributed the differences between their data and Mehan's in part to the special teacher training program the Inuit teachers underwent. This program was a closed system–Inuit participation only–so traditional discourse patterns were maintained. Furthermore,

> emphasis on peer rather than individual responses in the organisation of classroom discourse allowed teachers to capitalise effectively on peer models in providing correct responses and also promoted important Inuit values of respect for others, cooperation and responsiblity for the peer group (p. 114).

Implications for teaching English language learners

Most tasks in schools, whether they are routines like greeting a teacher upon entering a classroom or event-specific like responding to a laboratory question in chemistry, are accomplished through language. In schools, during the course of their daily business, students are expected to use different registers of the language and apply different conversational styles depending on the context and expectations of the interlocutors. According to Cazden (1988), schools make language central to communication in three ways:

1) much teaching takes place through spoken language;
2) while classrooms are among the most crowded human environments, usually only one conversation takes place, one which is highly controlled by the teacher, in contrast to other crowded places (e.g., restaurants) where multiple, less controlled conversations occur; and
3) individual identity is linked to spoken language, particularly the variety one speaks.

The prevailing use of language for school success has major implications for English language learners. Thus, a number of suggestions and words of caution for teaching and learning in secondary second language classrooms where students are learning English can be drawn from this review of the literature on discourse analysis, cross-cultural communication, and classroom interaction.

Provide explicit instruction about discourse patterns

The recommendation that recurs most frequently across the literature is for teachers to explicitly instruct their students in the discourse style of the classroom. For students who experience different communication styles and interaction patterns in their homes, they must learn about the social context for language use in a classroom (Heath, 1983; Jordan, 1992; Michaels & Collins, 1984; Philips, 1983). Explicit teaching is needed in a variety of areas, ranging from strategies for conversation management to strategies for presenting, defending and clarifying information to strategies for meta-linguistic awareness. Making explicit the implicit rules of the classroom, such as the teacher's style of allocating turns, expectations associated with language use, routine activities, and so forth, is important for students who are learning English and who, as newcomers to schools, need to develop classroom cultural competence. Students should be taught the behaviors and language associated with routines and with discipline as well. "If the principles of behavior to which the routines refer exist only in the teacher's mind, it will be necessary to make explicit to students the intent and behaviors meant by these formulaic routines" (Heath, 1978, p. 17). It is difficult for English language learners to infer a teacher's intention from an indirect statement.

Within this review of the literature, a number of researchers and scholars expressed their belief that student participation and subsequent learning through classroom discourse can be enhanced when the students have more knowledge about how language works. Meta-lingusitic awareness may be particularly useful with students at the secondary level when they begin to have a sense of their own learning styles and strategies. Edmonson (1985), in his consideration of multiple discourse worlds, asserted that students learn foreign languages better when they attend to the discourse worlds present in classroom talk and understand the different functions of both speech and actions. He recommended that teachers deliberately raise students' consciousness about being a language learner; in other words, teachers need to focus on issues of meta-language as well as language use through forms and functions. Kramsch (1985) and Færch (1985) echoed this appeal for teaching students meta-linguistic awareness.

Another area for explicit instruction is the structural management of spoken interaction. As Ernst (1994) concluded, "Students need explicit instruction in taking turns, interrupting and listening actively...they need to be in classroom environments where conversation and negotiation are not only encouraged but carefully orchestrated, supported and monitored by the teacher" (p. 315). As students further their lingusitic proficiency, they should also be taught how to vary the length of their turns, and how to extend or clarify them. Part of managing a conversation involves recognizing specific markers that inform the structure and expectations. For instance, students should detect signals for controlling the discourse (verbal and non-verbal cues) and should distinguish intonation patterns (e.g., rising statements that indicate a question).

Besides learning a variety of strategies such as getting the floor, interrupting, and controlling topic selection (Cazden, 1988; Ernst, 1994; Kramsch, 1985; Mehan, 1979), students also need to learn linguistic management strategies of spoken interaction. Use of formulaic speech is one area that English language learners can benefit from adding to their repertoire (McCarthy, 1991). Acknowledging their limitations with the language and requesting help is another (Kramsch, 1985). Specific negotiating skills are also of critical importance. Students should be taught how to explain, clarify, negotiate meaning, confirm, repeat, rephrase, and so on - all skills that occur repeatedly in natural discourse and in classroom interaction (Pica, 1987; Solomon & Rhodes, in press). They may learn these strategies through native speaker - non-native speaker conversations both within the classroom and outside the school.

Kramsch (1985) pointed out that students similarly need to be taught face-saving strategies and strategies of indirectness. These include strategies for gaining time, hedging, commenting, or paraphrasing in a group situation when one has nothing new to add to a discussion; using prefacing markers (Excuse me, but...) and mitigators (Would you mind repeating?); echoing statements; and giving feedback (e.g., through back channeling). Native speakers learn these strategies naturally, through ordinary observations and interactions throughout their lives, but secondary English language learners have less time and considerably fewer opportunities to

observe and comprehend how these strategies are used. Therefore, they should receive direct instruction and practice.[2]

Researchers recommend that teachers select strategies that help students understand discourse patterns and give them opportunities to participate in interactions where those patterns would occur. Tough (1979) explained which strategies she found that improved classroom talk so students learned more through talk. These strategies included: teaching students how to ask information questions, varying interaction size in class (e.g., large group, small group), organizing instruction to promote more higher-order thinking and discussion, and using multimedia opportunities to explore through other learning modes.

Enhance teacher preparation

Another key implication that can be drawn from the research involves teachers and their professional preparation. Teachers need to increase their knowledge about their own discourse, about the linguistic demands of the content area they teach, and about the cultures and communication styles of their students. Although few, if any, pre-service programs train potential teachers to recognize and appreciate cultural discourse patterns or even the language embedded in their particular content area discipline, teachers on job need to pay attention to discourse as it is used in their classrooms, among students, within textbooks, and between teacher and student.

Teachers can monitor spoken interaction that occurs in their classrooms. In discussions directed towards the teacher's instruction, Tough (1979) exhorted teachers to consider their beliefs and values about learning and their expectations for children's learning as they began to analyze their own discourse. She also provided a guide for teachers to examine the use of language by children in their classes by observing, recording and classifying that use into seven major categories: self-maintaining, directing, reporting, reasoning, predicting, projecting, and imagining. Teachers were encouraged to note the context in which the use occurred.

---

[2] Because different cultures and languages have distinct, appropriate linguistic management strategies (for face-saving, indirectness, and so on), foreign language learners also benefit from direct instruction in these discourse patterns.

Cazden (1988), Heath (1978, 1983), Michaels and Collins (1984), and Solomon and Rhodes (1995) also highlighted the expectation side of instruction. By making teachers aware of their personal communication styles and how that translated into expectations regarding how students *should* talk, the researchers were able to help teachers see that their narrow perspectives limited student participation in class. This point links back to the earlier recommendation for explicit instruction. In these cases, teachers needed to become aware of what should be taught explicitly, namely the discourse style associated with academic settings. After teachers recognize and understand the structural and functional features of their own discourse, they can begin to use alternative strategies for communication with and by students (Heath, 1978). When different discourse patterns are used in class, such as more open-ended discussions, problem-solving, learner-centered activities and agendas, language skills improve.

A related need in teacher preparation is training in the linguistic demands of individual content areas. Once content teachers become aware of the language registers of their courses, they can begin to set aside time to focus exclusively on language issues. Some lessons for English language learners may focus on the technical vocabulary or syntactical style of the subject, while others may focus on operations (e.g., mathematical algorithms) or conceptual development (e.g., through laboratory experiments) (Spanos, Rhodes, Dale & Crandall, 1988). For some researchers (Warren & Rosebery, 1995), language is so integral to the construction of scientific knowledge that teachers with English language learners in their classes must find ways to bring those students into the scientific discourse community. This communication process might occur through the use of native language so the scientific concepts are learned and then the English terms and phraseology are taught (Lemke, 1990). Prophet and Dow (1994) found that conceptual development can be enhanced through the use of the students' first language.

Another important awareness for teachers is the distinction between content-obligatory language and content-compatible language (Snow, Met & Genesee, 1987). The more that teachers can reinforce the type of language that crosses content areas (content-compatible), especially the language teachers who might have a broader view of those subjects, the better. Again, time is a

critical issue for secondary learners and all shortcuts, such as recognizing and being able to utilize language patterns and academic tasks across subjects, are worthwhile.

A third consideration in professional development is the cultural discourse patterns students bring to school. Whereas students need to learn about academic discourse styles, teachers need to learn about their students' home cultures. They need to understand the discourse patterns, both the linguistic and paralinguistic influences, plus they need to learn the culture's communication values. For instance, if one member of the culture rarely singles out one specific individual to speak in group settings, then teachers who nominate individual students to speak may create confusion and anxiety in children (Philips, 1983). Teachers benefit from this knowledge in that they learn which academic language skills need to be taught, how to interpret school-based language assessment results, what expected school discourse features have negative value (Heath, 1978).

Create opportunities for language learning

Finally, discourse analysis research implies that educators must create multiple and frequent opportunities for language learning in their classes. First, teachers should foster a more natural style of discourse, like conversation outside of the classroom (Kramsch, 1985). If teachers decrease the number of low-level, known-answer questions they ask and increase the number of information, inference, and opinion questions, students have richer targets for language use. As a result, exploratory talk (Cazden, 1988; Fisher, 1993), which promotes language learning, can occur. Spoken interaction becomes more meaningful to students (and not only to English language learners). Moreover, through student-student interactions, in small groups, with or without native speakers, students can learn turn-taking and topic control strategies more readily. Kramsch (1985) also recommended that teachers follow natural rules of repair in their spoken interactions with students. Teachers should not, for instance, interrupt students for accuracy errors if the communicative intent is clear.

A natural style of discourse also implies opportunities for negotiation. As Pica and colleagues (1987, 1989) found, negotiation leads to better proficiency in English. As students

struggle to make themselves understood or to understand another's words, they manipulate the language, test their hypotheses about how language works, check that their utterances make sense to their conversational partner(s), and more. These are things that native speakers do infrequently, if at all, (except young children still acquiring English). English language learners, however, may need some planned interventions to create these practice situations.

Second, students and teachers need to reexamine their roles and power status to promote better social interaction (Edmonson, 1985; Pica, 1987). Teachers can begin by examining their classroom management styles, namely turn-taking, topic control, and questionning patterns. The research revealed that teachers who change roles in class, thereby reducing their power status, create more opportunities for language learning among students. Students, too, especially those from cultures that view education as a transmission model with the teacher as expert, may have to redefine their roles in class. To learn English they can not be passive participants; they must be actively involved in the spoken interaction. Teachers can guide students in this role shift.

Third, teachers need to explore more widely the use and choice of native language instuction for attaining understanding of concepts and for accomplishing tasks (Cummins, 1981; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1994; Lemke, 1990; Prophet & Dow, 1994). If the instructional goal is content knowledge, the use of the students' first language is an efficient means for reaching it. More rich discussion takes place when the topic is discussed in the native language. However, students must be assisted in making the transition in order to communicate about the topic in English. The research showed that facility with the English language is enhanced when students have prior knowledge and/or experience about the topic. Conceptual knowledge transfers across languages; English semantics, syntax and pragmatics can be attached to that previously-acquired knowledge.

Finally, research has begun to reveal the importance of joint construction of knowledge. As students construct knowledge jointly, with peers or a teacher, they create a shared history and common core of knowledge that provides the basis for discussion and expansion. Just as reading comprehension is bolstered by activating a student's background schema, so spoken interaction is

enhanced (and language learning opportunities are generated) when interlocutors seek to develop common knowledge that results in a shared schema. Through discussion they can raise their level of understanding, by posing questions, negotiating output, solving problems–in general, by building on or challenging one another's contributions. This joint construction of knowledge can promote higher-level thinking, more sophisticated language (e.g., nuance, careful choice of lexical items, complex grammatical structures, cohesive discourse) and meaningful spoken interactions.

Conclusion

Discourse analysis studies have taken place for over three decades and will continue to be conducted. Debates over the purpose of the analysis, the units of analysis to use, the influence of individual styles and strategies versus the influence of sociolinguistic and sociocultural context on learning language may persist, but so far, discourse analysis has opened windows on how students learn language, engage in discourse, and preserve, accommodate or modify their own cultural comunication patterns and values, and on how teachers interact with students in class.

In the future, discourse analysis may be able to offer more insights into how secondary English language learners could acquire English and content knowledge faster. Promising instructional practices, such as increased interaction between native and non-native speakers, two-way bilingual education programs, or integrated language and content courses in particular subject areas, might prove very successful and comparisons between the ELLs' acquisiton of English and ability to communicate through English in different subject areas could be charted against a native speaking peer's ability. Discourse analysis may also reveal any benefits that changes in teacher preparation programs might offer, such as a reduced reliance on a transmission model of teaching and more attention paid to linguistic issues in content classes. In sum, discourse analysis is not only a useful tool for researchers interested in second and foreign language learning, but it is an exciting means for discerning changes in communication patterns at any given moment or across time, within one person or among several.

Research Findings and Project Accomplishments

The section will provide further details about several aspects of the research and address research findings and instructional implications. The first part of this section will focus on the more traditional social studies classroom where the integration of language development with content area objectives is not an overt goal. The type of instruction found in those classes and an analysis of commercial textbooks will be described with implications for ELLs drawn. Next the discussion will turn to the research interventions (e.g., the instructional units) and the strategies effective teachers use to integrate language and content. Finally, a typology of social studies academic language and commentary on the culture of the classroom and how it may become a composite culture will be offered.

Social Studies Instruction and Textbook Analysis

As the previous section revealed, one focus of our larger literature review examined current trends in social studies instruction. Specifically we searched for information on social studies program design, pedagogy, curriculum, and social studies learners, with particular interest in documents that might address English language learners. In terms of social studies programs, we found that most social studies departments in middle schools teach traditional, separate courses like American history or ancient civilizations (Parker, 1991). In some instances, more innovative programs, like interdisciplinary classes (e.g., integrated social studies and English) are being implemented (ibid.). In our own project schools, social studies was an independent department, although some teachers created interdisciplinary units to infuse objectives from other content areas. None were part of an interdisciplinary program.

Pedagogical practices, on the other hand, appear more open to change than program design in the social studies field. Numerous articles have appeared in social studies journals, such as *Social Education,* chronicling new techniques and approaches for educators to incorporate in their teaching repertoire. Inquiry-based classrooms, oral histories, and historical interpretation through

authentic source material represent only some of the proposed practices. Unfortunately though, more social studies classes continue to follow the teacher lecture-textbook reading format than to follow innovative pedagogies (Thornton, 1994). To overcome this tendency, we designed our project materials, as described later, to maximize innovations.

Our classroom visits confirmed a heavy emphasis on the recitation script style of instruction, where the teacher asked a question (often a simple recall question), nominated a student to respond, and evaluated that response before moving on to the next question. Although the lessons we designed tried to reduce opportunities for the recitation script, several teachers still conducted a large part of the lessons in that mode. This style is less effective for English language learners, many of whom benefit from meaningful, oral interactions to strengthen their language development. The recitation style, in contrast, reduces the amount of time students have to talk and limits cognitive practice with its emphasis on simple factual questions. Teachers also usually have brief wait-times and students are not often prompted to expand their responses or to add onto a classmate's.

We found a great deal of consistency in curriculum frameworks at the elementary and secondary levels with regard to the subject matter expected to be studied, although the recommended grade for teaching different specific courses varied in the secondary curricula. We concluded, however, that these curriculum frameworks would pose difficulties for English language learners for four primary reasons. First, under the expanding communities approach of the elementary grades (promulgated by commercial textbooks), concepts, and objectives taught in first grade are reviewed and built upon in later years, so newly-arrived students who enroll in U.S. schools in third or fourth grade will have missed some foundations of the curricula. Provisions for closing this gap in background information are not established. Second, at the secondary level, curricula and textbooks expect a depth of knowledge that new students do not often have. A case in point is the California *History-Social Science Framework* (California State Department of Education, 1987), which advocates teaching different segments of American history in different years, such as the mid-1400s to 1850 in the fifth grade and 1783 to 1914 in the eighth. This

practice, however helpful for the mainstream class that has increasing amounts of curricular material to cover, nonetheless raises problems for English language learners. Third, because the K-12 curricula in the United States are very Euro-centered in their historical and political perspectives, even students with prior schooling will have much new information to learn if they come from countries that teach non-Western, non-Euro-centered histories.

The fourth issue relates to future curriculum development. Over the next few years, most state and local education agencies will rewrite their social studies curricula to reflect the new national standards currently being drafted and finalized by professional associations in the history, social studies, civics, and geography fields. It is discouraging that none of these documents specifically refer to English language learners in their prefatory materials when describing who *all* students are, nor consider the instructional needs of these learners in the recommended pedagogical techniques or in the classroom exemplars of the standards in use. Because these documents will become the guidelines for state and local education agencies, such inattention to ELLs will further marginalize the social studies instruction they will receive.

This notion of marginalization relates to the next area we examined, literature on the teaching of social studies to English language learners; of which we found very little. Freeland (1991), for example, in his book on the social studies curriculum, includes a chapter on special needs students, but does not discuss linguistically or culturally diverse students. National organizations, such as the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), have not issued guidelines or recommended strategies for teaching these students. In a recent publication (NCSS, 1992), the sole discussion of language learning framed the issue in terms of learning two languages and studying about languages from a sociolinguistic point of view, not in terms of making social studies content comprehensible to English language learners. In fact, most articles that address this issue at all have been written by language educators (see, for instance, Freeman & Freeman, 1991; Holt, Chips & Wallace, 1992; King, Fagan, Bratt & Baer, 1987; Short, 1994).

One positive trend for ELLs, however, is the movement towards multicultural education in the social studies field. The incorporation of other cultures in instructional materials is increasingly

being advocated (Banks & Banks, 1989; Bernstein Cohen, 1986; Risinger, 1992; Thornton, 1994). Even the national standards referred to above offer guiding principles that demonstrate an appreciation of cultural diversity:

> Students construct a **pluralistic perspective** based on diversity...Students need to learn that the existence of cultural and philosophical differences are not "problems" to be solve [sic]; they are potentially healthy and desirable qualities of democratic community life.
>
> Students construct a global perspective that includes knowledge, skills and commitments needed to live wisely in a world that possesses limited resources and that is characterized by cultural diversity.... (National Council for the Social Studies, 1994: 6)

Social Studies Literacy

Our research has revealed that teaching social studies to English language learners is a very challenging endeavor. By examining mainstream social studies classes we were able to determine several areas of mismatch between the requirements of that content area with other core areas and with the skills of beginning and intermediate level English language learners (Short, 1994). As a discipline, the study of social studies is closely bound to literacy skills. Social studies continues to rely heavily on the textbook and teacher lecture to present the bulk of the information students are expected to learn. This practice differs from current trends in mathematics and science pedagogy (cf. NCTM, 1989; AAAS, 1989) where increased use of manipulatives and hands-on activities are regular features of instruction. A mismatch occurs with this aspect of social studies instruction because learners with lower levels of English proficiency tend to have weaker literacy skills, as defined by reading and writing ability. With a heavy emphasis on this mode of information transmission, ELLs are at a disadvantage.

The second, related area of mismatch concerns the type of text being read. Most of the readings in social studies texts are expository, not narrative, in style. ELLs would be less familiar with this style because narrative text is traditionally emphasized in beginning and intermediate ESL classes. The amount of reading and writing in social studies classes surpasses that of most math or science classes, and the expository reading passages are long and filled with abstract concepts and unfamiliar schema that cannot be easily demonstrated to students through visuals or actions.

Besides the reading skills needed to comprehend textbooks, students in social studies classes need to be able to interpret maps, charts, and timelines, as they need to do in other content areas. Social studies textbooks provide visual aids with pictures and photographs of historical events and people, landforms, and other objects. These are somewhat helpful because they provide students with a definite image, but at times the text pictures do not highlight the main concepts being discussed in the narrative and therefore can distract or mislead ELLs.

The writing tasks in social studies, which often focus on two extremes, represent a third mismatch. At one end of the continuum, students are asked to respond to recall questions found at the end of a chapter. Students can be taught to look up factual information in the narrative and write the required response, but other than improving their information-seeking skills, this type of question does not further students' language development. The other end of the spectrum is much more demanding, requiring students to write comparison-contrast, problem-solution, or cause-effect essays. Composing these types of essays well depends on considerable background knowledge, which places newly arrived students at a disadvantage. It is also more difficult for ELLs to learn to write these essays, particularly because many social studies teachers consider writing as part of the language arts teacher's domain[1]. Therefore, they do not focus on developing essay skills. Yet, many English language learners need assistance in organizing information within the context of an academic subject.

Social Studies Textbooks

Another component of our research involved textbook analysis. As mentioned earlier, we reviewed both American history and World studies books, because ELLs will be exposed to and expected to utilize mainstream textbooks when they are in regular social studies classes. For the first level of analysis, we examined a cross-section of popular commercial textbooks, some of which were used in our project classes. A second level of analysis was done on two American

[1] Although Risinger (1992), for one, calls for more writing *practice* in social studies, particularly assignments that integrate writing and critical thinking skills, the *process* of learning to write is not the focus.

history series. For this, we examined several editions of the same textbooks to determine if and how they have changed over time.

Classroom textbooks are useful artifacts to examine when considering the dominant culture of a classroom. Thirty-three states and the District of Columbia adopt textbooks for all the districts under their domain (Keith, 1991; Tyson-Bernstein, 1988; Woodward, 1989), so use of one particular text is often extended statewide. Moreover, the more popular "brands" are used across many states and new editions are generally published every five years. From a sociocultural vantage, this frequent revision process makes it is possible to examine modifications to subsequent editions in light of changes in educational policy and cultural norms.

Although analyses of textbooks are not new, they are important for understanding part of the teaching and learning process in classrooms because textbooks drive the curriculum and the instructional practices in most schools (Apple, 1992; Finkelstein, Nielsen, & Switzer, 1993; Tyson-Bernstein, 1988; Woodward, 1989). A number of studies have focused on readability levels and writing styles with attention to aspects of coherence and cohesion (e.g., Beck & McKeown, 1991; Brophy & Alleman, 1991; Tyson-Bernstein, 1988) and overall judged most textbooks to be poorly written. For instance, Brophy, McMahon & Prawat (1991) critiqued a popular elementary social studies series (student books and teacher's guides) and found undeveloped ideas and concepts, disconnected information presented as a series of facts, a general lack of coherence within the prose, and the absence of integration of skills and knowledge in the narrative. Beck, McKeown and Gromoll (1989) examined upper elementary textbooks and measured student reading comprehension, finding that many texts lacked coherence, had poor visual organization and varied types of writing, and used headings and illustrations inappropriately.

As a result of findings like these, reading researchers have suggested several instructional techniques. Recognizing the problematic features of texts, they have advocated strategic teaching strategies that activate student background knowledge and frame instructional reading assignments accordingly, using activities such as vocabulary overviews, prediction guides and graphic

organizers (Alvermann, 1987; Armbruster, Anderson & Meyer, 1990; Beck and McKeown, 1991; Franklin & Roach, 1992). Drum (1984) has further recommended that difficult content (e.g., that for which students lack background schema) be framed within text structures familiar to students and, likewise, that new or difficult structures be introduced using familiar content.

Other research studies have performed content analyses across multiple texts dealing with the same subject matter. These studies have considered a range of evaluative criteria: type and presentation of the content, diversity of illustrations, number of examples and anecdotes reflecting diverse groups of people, inclusion of authentic sources, stereotyping, and more (e.g., Brophy, McMahon & Prawat, 1991; Sleeter & Grant, 1991; Tyson-Bernstein, 1988). Many studies of this sort concluded that minority groups and women were inadequately portrayed in commercial social studies textbooks (e.g., Brown, 1980, Epstein, 1991) and others considered the unbalanced portrait to reflect the lack of empowerment of these groups in the dominant culture (e.g., Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Love, 1989a, 1989b).

Studies conducted on the representation of specific ethnic groups in American history textbooks have revealed that even though more recent textbooks have increased their coverage of information on certain individual groups, most of the additional content is tagged onto the end of a chapter, placed in a sidebar outside the main narrative, or dropped into a new chapter, usually at the beginning or end of a structural unit. In general, textbooks continue to present a Eurocentric point of view, largely ignoring the roles and contributions played by other, non-Europeans to the development of America. For example, Chapman (1983) criticizes textbooks for ignoring the scholarship on women in history, and Harris (1983) concluded that revised narratives did not include substantive African-American history or culture. Matte (1993) and Weatherford (1991) pointed out that the culture and motivations of Native Americans are almost invisible in textbooks, while Fleming's analysis (1982) showed the treatment of Latin America in secondary texts rarely appeared unless to focus on the military and political relations with the United States.

Some researchers suggest that by rarely putting information about the diversity of American peoples and culture in the main body of the narrative, the textbooks send the not-so-subtle message

that diversity is not important. Love (1989a) points out that the practice of sidebarring diversity is part of the hidden curriculum where children learn to "evaluate society from the point of view of those in power" (p.7). Love (1989b) recommends that social studies curricula be designed to develop "respect for cultural differences and recognition of contributions which all groups have made to the United States and to the world" (p. 6).

Cross-series textbook analysis

In examining several popular American history textbooks that are used in the middle grades[2], we reviewed the units and chapters that addressed the pre-revolutionary and revolutionary period of American history, from the end of the French and Indian War to the end of the Revolutionary War (1763-1781). For the World studies texts[3], we selected chapters on Spanish exploration in South America in the 16th century, the Reformation, and Japanese-Western civilization relations in the mid to late 19th century. An attempt to review the Ethiopian struggle for independence was thwarted by lack of information on the topic in the books. Our analysis considered both the academic language found in the texts and the representations of cultural diversity. Although we compared several features of the textbooks, including the chronology of the historical events presented, the presence and usefulness of chapter and section previews, the amount of text dedicated to the topic at hand, and the rhetorical styles and coherence across concepts, we will focus on the structure level of the texts, the treatment of vocabulary, and the ways in which the books represent diversity.

Expository text is usually categorized by six types of text-structures: sequential or chronological; cause-effect; problem-solution; description; enumeration; and comparison-contrast. (For detailed explanations see Herber, 1970 and Vacca and Vacca, 1993.) In the textbooks we analyzed, we found sequencing and cause-effect structures to be the most prevalent organizational

[2] These books included *Two Centuries of Progress* (Jackson & Perrone, 1991), *History of the United States to 1877* (Mason, Jacobs & Ludlum, 1992), *America Will Be* (Armento, Nash, Salter & Wixson, 1991), *Exploring American History* (O'Connor, 1991), *The United States: Peoples and Leaders* (Abramowitz & Abramowitz, 1981), and *A More Perfect Union* (Armento, Nash, Salter, & Wixson, 1991).

[3] These books included *To See a World* (Armento, Klor de Alva, Nash, Salter, Wilson, & Wixson, 1994), *World Cultures* (Ahmad, Brodsky, Crofts, & Ellis, 1993), and *The Non-western World* (Schwartz & O'Connor, 1988).

features of the chapters. However, even if one supraordinate structure were present in a chapter, other structures were developed. For example, in *Exploring American History*, Unit 5, Chapter 3 (Globe, 1991), "The Colonists Resist Taxation without Representation," is predominantly organized around a cause-effect structure, although the author uses sequence markers to guide the presentation of events. The historical time frame represented is the pre-revolutionary period between 1765 and 1773. Most of the presentation centers around the British actions, the colonists' reactions/actions, and then the British subsequent actions.

The textbooks use language to enhance the logical connections of the structures framing the narrative as the following excerpts from a passage in *Exploring American History* (1991, pp. 186-87) illustrate: *Parliament passed a tax law called the Stamp Act...colonists refused to obey... Parliament voted to end the Stamp Act... However... Parliament passed the Declaratory Act... Because the British government still needed money, Parliament in 1767 passed the Townshend Acts... The Townshend Acts caused more and more colonists to protest...* The word choice (e.g., refused to obey, increased their protest, voted to end, caused more and more colonists to protest) and the transition markers (e.g., however, because) reinforce the cause-effect relationship, showing that the colonists reacted to British actions in the hopes of changing the situation. Furthermore, since cause-effect events by definition proceed in a sequential order (i.e., a cause must occur before an effect), the text also marks the passage with temporal words and phrases.

Regarding the treatment of vocabulary in these textbooks, our analysis concluded that it is inadequate for English language learners. Several key terms are selected per chapter (range 5-10) and highlighted in the text. Some texts define the bold terms within the narrative, but others rely upon the glossary for the definitions. The difficulty for English language learners is that many of the important words are not identified as the key terms. For students who have received little schooling in the United States and therefore generally have limited background knowledge of these words, the vocabulary can be a major obstacle to comprehension. Unfamiliar with terms, such as *liberty, protest, rebel, conquistador, terrace farming*, and *imperialism*, immigrant and refugee students new to the U.S. are disserved when the majority of the vocabulary items are not given any

depth of discussion in the textbooks. Only one of the American history books and only one of the World studies books examined listed words besides the designated key terms in the glossary, and these additional listings were not adequate. So, for most of the vocabulary items that were apt to be problematic, English language learners needed to use an outside source, such as a dictionary, teacher or peer, to aid their comprehension.

We chose to examine the representation of cultural diversity in textbooks because it is related to a goal shared by both language and social studies educators. Language educators seek to understand the cultural background of English language learners and make them feel comfortable in American society. Social studies educators seek to help students understand the diverse peoples that constitute society and the influences they both exert and feel. As *Lessons from History* (Crabtree, Nash, Gagnon, & Waugh, 1992) states:

> An understanding of society is indispensable to an understanding of human history. Basic to United States history, for example, is the story of the gathering of the many and diverse peoples and cultures that have created and are still transforming American society. (p. 28)

We interpreted these statements to mean that not only should students study about the activities of these diverse peoples, but they should also learn about their points of view and be able to reflect on history from their perspectives.

However, we found that this does not occur in the main narrative of most textbooks. All the American history textbooks, not surprisingly, tell the history of pre-revolutionary and revolutionary America from the American point of view, primarily that of the Patriots who decided to fight for freedom. Overall, the books present a Eurocentric focus, largely ignoring the roles and contributions played by other, non-Europeans to the development of the United States. Specifically, readers receive little information about the roles of women, African Americans and Native Americans as well as the Loyalists and the colonists who remained neutral during the war. As the literature review predicted, most of the textbooks included some references to the diversity, but placed such information at the end of a chapter, in a sidebar outside the main narrative, or in a new chapter, at the beginning or end of a unit. The overall impression is that information about diverse peoples is less important to American history. Table 1 provides an overview of the types

Table 1

CULTURAL DIVERSITY REPRESENTATIONS IN SIX MIDDLE SCHOOL TEXTS: AMERICAN HISTORY FROM 1763 TO 1781

Two Centuries of Progress	• A special section, "Historical Documents," discusses Thomas Jefferson's original paragraph in the Declaration that condemned the commerce of slavery and the decision to exclude it from the final document. • There is no incorporation of women and very little of other ethnic groups in the main narrative. • Two of 20 illustrations show women, one shows an African American soldier. • Crispus Attucks is mentioned briefly in the description of the Boston Massacre. • Native Americans are referred to as "Indians" at the Boston Tea Party. The other reference occurs during the description of the Revolutionary War and recounts that British encouraged Indians to fight American settlers.
History of the United States: Beginnings to 1877	• Each unit ends with the sections, "American Mosiac: A Multicultural Perspective" which gives brief biographies of lesser-known famous women and other ethnic and racial figures; and "Historian's Corner" which debates an issue of the time with authentic sources. In the unit we reviewed, Mercy Otis Warren and Alexis de Tocqueville debated federalism. • Some references made to various people within the main narrative represent diversity, for instance, actions of African Americans during the war are mentioned as are those of women. • Crispus Attucks is mentioned briefly in the description of the Boston Massacre. • Native Americans are referred to as "Indians" at the Boston Tea Party. The other references are mainly negative: the text says most Indians took the British side, recounted that Clark scalped Indians who fought on the British side, and noted that Gálvez had to buy gifts for the Indians in order to gain their support. One reference said Greene won the Cherokees over to the Patriot side. • In the section reviews, 29 people are selected as important to know about. Of the 29, one is an African American (Crispus Attucks), one is Latino (Bernardo de Gálvez), none are women, none are Native Americans, and four are non-British European soldiers who fought in the Revolutionary War (Lafayette, von Stueben, Kosciusko, and Rochambeau). • Brief biographies and quotes are present in the text. The selections reflect gender diversity but not ethnic or racial diversity.
America Will Be	• Discussion of the roles of women and ethnic groups are incorporated into the main narrative, but headed sections appear at the end of the chapter (Loyalists, Black and Indian Americans) • Illustrations reflect the cultural diversity of the colonies. • Crispus Attucks is mentioned briefly in the description of the Boston Massacre and his picture is shown with a caption.

	• One of six primary source quotations in the chapters examined was authored by women, none by Native Americans or African Americans. • The one literature piece in these chapters was about a women, Sybil Ludington. • Native Americans ("Indians") are mentioned occasionally in several places in the main narrative (e.g., Proclamation of 1763, Iroquois soldiers in Revolutionary War).
Exploring American History	• A separate chapter is placed at the end of the unit with sections for women, African Americans and Patriots v. Loyalists. • Apart from above mentioned chapter, some discussion of diversity appears in the main narrative (e.g., discussions of Mercy Otis Warren, the Daughters of Liberty, and foreign soldiers), but not very much. • Three of the 14 illustrations are multicultural (one shows a crowd scene with an African American and a woman, another shows some women, a third portrays an African American). • The unit includes special sections and sidebars; some feature diverse peoples, like the Daughters of Liberty. Titles of these sections are "America's Peoples," "Point of View," and "People in History." • Crispus Attucks is mentioned briefly in the description of the Boston Massacre. • Native Americans are referred to as "Native Americans" at the Boston Tea Party. No other references are made during the revolutionary period.
The United States: Peoples and Leaders	• Text makes some reference to cultural and ethnic groups, including African American and foreign soldiers who fought during the Revolutionary War. • Includes full-page profiles on famous people, all men: a Native American, Chief Pontiac; an African American, Crispus Attucks; and a Polish immigrant, Haym Solomon. • No information is provided on the role of women. • Most illustrations (20) depict white men, one shows Chief Pontiac, two show African Americans, two show picketers which include some women but which do not correspond to the time frame of the narrative. • Native Americans are referred to as "Indians" at the Boston Tea Party. No other references, besides profile of Chief Pontiac, are made during the revolutionary period.
A More Perfect Union	• Text refers to women and their roles in the main narrative. • Of the four primary sources, two are women's writings. • Only two of 13 illustrations depict women. • In the last lesson at the end of the chapter, there is a section about the war's impact on social groups with separate headings for Blacks, Indians, and women. • Crispus Attucks is mentioned briefly in the description of the Boston Massacre. • Native Americans are referred to as "Indians" at the Boston Tea Party. No other references are made during the revolutionary period.

of diversity we examined in the chapters that addressed the pre-revolutionary and revolutionary periods of American history.

The World studies books, however, presented a different picture. By definition they reflected cultural diversity in their chapters and units. However, most of the information focused on well-known groups of peoples, such as the Mayan, Aztec, and Incan groups in South America; very little information was offered on other groups living during the historical times discussed. The World studies books, did also do a good job on presenting a variety of authentic sources, but their information on historical women and their roles was fairly sketchy.

In general, the cross-series textbook-analysis revealed potential academic language difficulties for ELLs. Although predictable text structures occurred within and across chapters that ELLs could be taught to recognize, the readability of the text, in terms of cohesion among topics and the vocabulary development, was low. Furthermore, the texts lacked balanced representation of diversity.

Cross-editions textbook analysis

This level of analysis focused exclusively on the cultural component of textbooks, examining two different American history texts: the 1986 and 1991 editions of *Exploring American History* (O'Connor, 1986, 1991) and the 1979, 1983, 1987, and 1991 editions of *The American Pageant* (Bailey & Kennedy, 1979, 1983, 1987, 1991). The criteria used in the analysis were derived from a number of sources: the 1984 Michigan State Board of Education's textbook selection and adoption evaluation form, the 1975 Illinois textbook adoption guidelines, other state and local district guidelines presented in Kunder (1976), "Guidelines for teaching about American Indian History" (1990, reproduced in Weatherford, 1991) and additional characteristics drawn from the literature review. Criteria included: location of information on diverse groups, diversity in illustrations, use of authentic and diverse source material, length and tone of discourse about diverse groups, type of information relayed, language choice in descriptions, use of multiple perspectives, change in group representation across editions, and more.

Due to the small scale nature of this analysis, different aspects of the two textbook series were examined. In *Exploring American History,* we examined the Table of Contents across all editions and the content and presentation of three time periods in American history–Columbus' arrival, events leading to the American Revolution, and the European-American settling of the Great Plains. In *The American Pageant,* the authors' prefaces were analyzed as well as the content and presentation of the Reconstruction. The time periods were specifically selected as clear examples of interactions of the dominant culture with a non-dominant one so that revisions produced for later editions might reflect new scholarship and public sentiment.

The most remarkable finding was that the textbooks did not change very much with the revision process. The addition of more color, glossy pages, and in some instances, brighter illustrations were more noticeable than changes in actual content. Authentic source material reflected a little more diversity in its origin and a few more examples of multiple perspectives were found, but rarely within the main narrative. Changes to the narrative, in fact, tended to be in the form of "wordsmithing," replacing one word or adjective with another, adding an additional sentence to the end of a paragraph, changing a title or heading to something that was less controversial. In both text series, a few new chapters were added, primarily a pre-Columbian section or unit to describe the Native Americans who lived in North and South America before European explorers arrived.

Some examples will illustrate the superficiality of many revisions. In 1986, *Exploring,* unit one, chapter two was titled "Columbus finds the New World," while in 1991, unit two (unit one now focused on the "early people" of America), chapter two was "Columbus sails west." The change indicates the authors' or publishers' responsiveness to the societal pressure and public outcry that was present in the years leading up to the so-called quincentennary of Columbus' arrival, but an examination of the actual chapter narrative revealed little else had changed. The perspectives of the Caribbean tribes were not reported, and descriptions of their daily lives, individual differences, cultural traditions, and so on were not provided. Indeed, the only changes

were the use of "Arawaks" to identify one of the tribes Columbus met, and a physical description and personality analysis of them as written by Columbus.

In 1991, *Exploring* made an effort to include more multicultural information and content by adding special sections to each unit, such as America's People and Points of View, but these sections held the status of a sidebar. The information was not woven into the main narrative, nor did the main text refer to these sections. The discussion of minority groups' viewpoints and cultures, although slightly increased in the 1991 edition, did not compete for space or importance in any instance with the dominant, European American viewpoint. Mercy Otis Warren, for example, is discussed in one paragraph in the chapter on pre-revolutionary America in the 1991 edition (she does not appear in the 1986 one), but she is the only women named in that chapter. However, over 10 colonial men are named and discussed as well as several British generals.

The treatment of the European American settlers moving to the Great Plains region fared a little better in its treatment of minorities, but that occurred primarily because a new chapter for the 1991 edition was written, "The Decline of Native Americans on the Great Plains." Although the overall tone of this chapter was that of the dominant culture, the victor in the "fight for land" in the region, more individual and tribal views of the Native Americans who lived in the Great Plains were presented. In the 1986 edition, the Native Americans were generally lumped together as Plains Indians, but in the 1991 edition distinctions between different tribes began to appear. Some motivations and daily activities of the Sioux, the Nez Percé, and the Apache were mentioned. Still, a negative spin permeated the discourse with the actions of Native American described as "rebellions" and "raids" while the U.S. government only blandly "relocate[d] at least 30 Native American tribes."

The *American Pageant* also provided few substantive changes despite bold claims of revised scholarship in the prefaces of the each new edition. Considering the following from different editions:

- additional information on the "effects of emancipation for 'masters' and slaves" (1983: v);
- to "bring to light the 'inner' histories of people—who until recently were only imperfectly visible to historians (1987: vi);
- "...a completely revised explanation of Reconstruction..." (1987: vi);

- "Like earlier revisions this one has been guided by two principles, first, the obligation to incorporate into the historical record the history of many people who until recently were only dimly visible to historians—including women, the working class, native Americans, African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians and certain religious communities..." (1991: vi); and
- "...[the] account of the Civil War is entirely new...culminating in the great triumph of emancipation and the great frustration and ultimate failure of Reconstruction to give African Americans their full measure of freedom..." (1991: vii),

the reader might expect a great deal of new prose, new perspectives, additional content and the like, but the analysis revealed those expectations to be unfulfilled.

The title of the chapter "The Ordeal of the Reconstruction" remained the same for all four editions and the bulk of the prose remained unchanged. The biggest reorganization and shift of perspective occurred between the 1983 and 1987 editions. By the 1987 one, the tone of the historical interpretation was no longer solely sympathetic to the white Southerners and derisive of the "selfish" radical Republicans in Congress, but credited the Republicans with some idealism and moral values when explaining the Reconstruction. What was particularly distressing was the almost invisible treatment of the feelings of the emancipated African Americans who lived in the south during that time. In all editions, they were referred to as "ignorant," "largely unskilled," "former human chattels," and "friendless and rootless souls." More amazing was the treatment of the Ku Klux Klan. In the first three editions, the section describing the Klan's activities was romantically titled "Knights of the White Sheet" and their actions were foremost described as "tomfoolery and terror" with mention of some savage atrocities buried later in the prose. Furthermore, two illustrations of their appearance and activities are included without a single critical comment in the prose or caption. In the 1991 edition the section was titled "Ku Klux Klan" but the prose and one of the illustrations with its caption remained the same.

This small-scale review, in sum, confirms findings of other studies that increased representation of diversity and "recent scholarship" are not taken seriously in new editions. The dominant culture continues to prevail, the tone of the discourse remains negative in regards to minority groups, and the location of material on newly described groups is, for the most part, outside the main narrative.

Materials Development

As we developed, field-tested, and revised the two curriculum units, *Protest and the American Revolution* and *Conflicts in World Studies*, we kept in mind the findings from the literature review and textbook analyses, and their implications for English language learners. In brief, some of the findings we considered included: making the social studies textbook reading process more comprehensible through vocabulary previews, graphic organizers, and so forth; improving the cohesion and coherence of the reading passages; activating background knowledge; implementing activities to integrate language functions and study skills with content knowledge; explicitly teaching linguistic cues of text structure; and making connections between key vocabulary words and related terms. We also considered research on content-based language instruction that suggested using cooperative learning, incorporating hands-on activities, exposing students to authentic materials, relating information to student experiences and knowledge, providing depth of knowledge rather than breadth, and developing critical thinking skills (Cantoni-Harvey, 1987; Crandall, 1987; Short, 1991).

To help mediate the cultural discontinuity ELLs might feel in mainstream classrooms, we chose to prepare materials with multicultural content. Although some teachers introduce multicultural concepts through the "foods, festivals and famous people" approach–giving students a sampling of cross-cultural information from time to time (e.g., discussing the life of a famous Mexican artist or reading a legend about Chinese New Year)–we elected to infuse it throughout the curriculum units we developed. Our approach may be compared to Banks' (1989), third level of multicultural education, "transformation," in that the materials systematically included multiple perspectives and multicultural content in substantive ways. Furthermore, we intended the materials to be used in ESL and mainstream classes, so not only language minority students would participate. This decision recognized that it is important for all students to learn about minority cultures and their contributions to society. In this way, schools can help equip all students with the skills needed to function in the culturally diverse world outside the school doors (Baker, 1994; Crawford, 1993; Nieto, 1992).

This assigned task, however, was not easy. Uncovering information about culturally diverse groups in history required investigating varied and esoteric resources, such as an out of print document on the chronology of Menelik II's life in 19th century Ethiopia (Prouty Rosenfeld, 1976). We also found conflicting information about historical events that needed to be filtered. In addition, we had to train teachers not only to recognize and capitalize on instances where students' cultural knowledge could be brought to the fore, but also to generate opportunities with the potential for that to occur. As Zeichner (1993) and Crawford (1993) reported, most teachers in U.S. schools are of European-American heritage, have lived in communities with predominantly European-American populations, and have studied under European-American focused curricula. Most are ignorant of both their own cultural assumptions and practices and their students'. Moreover, most of their teacher training courses did not provide strategies for teaching linguistically and culturally diverse students.

Nonetheless we were able to define the following guiding principles (Table 2) for designing the unit lessons:

Table 2

Guiding Principles for Integrated Language, Culture and Social Studies Materials

1. Offer opportunities to communicate about social studies - in oral, written, physical, or pictorial forms;
2. Make connections between the content being taught and students' real-life experiences;
3. Tap the students as resources for information about their native countries;
4. Activate students' background knowledge;
5. Provide hands-on and performance-based activities;
6. Promote critical thinking and study skill development;
7. Pay attention to language issues and employ strategies that will help students learn the language of social studies;
8. Use graphic organizers to help students represent information and identify relationships;
9. Incorporate cooperative learning activities and seek peer tutors among classmates;

10. Be process-oriented and provide modeling for students to make transition to academic tasks;

11. Open discussion to different perspectives of history; and

12. Adjust instruction for the different learning styles of the students.

In choosing a theme for each unit, we sought to make connections between the themes as applied to American history or World studies and to the middle school students' lives, experiences and/or knowledge. For American history, we chose the theme of protest, because many students had lived in countries that have experienced wars and other forms of civil disturbance. By relating that knowledge to the relevant events and philosophies of the American revolutionary era, teachers could help students understand the development of the American democratic tradition. Furthermore, we reasoned, protest would generate active communication among the adolescent students.

For World studies, we explored various types of conflict (cultural, economic, religious and political) and conflict resolution (resistance, withdrawal, separation, negotiation) for similar reasons. Many language minority students experienced cultural and value conflicts when they arrived in the U.S. or when they began to interact with diverse groups in their middle school. Their personal experiences, coupled with current events on local, national and international levels, would provide foundation schema to help students comprehend the historical events. The causes and resolutions of these historical conflicts were especially timely since many schools offer peer mediation and conflict resolution classes to students.

All lessons were designed to incorporate content, language and thinking/study skill objectives with student-centered activities in order to make social studies more accessible for English language learners. The lessons gave students a chance to acquire and enrich knowledge individually and cooperatively through reading tasks with authentic and adapted texts, role-plays and interviews, physical movement and drama, art projects, process writing, and library research. The content objectives were drawn from commercial textbooks, curricula, and documents such as *Lessons from History: Essential Understandings and Historical Perspectives Students Should*

Acquire (Crabtree, Nash, Gagnon & Waugh, 1992) and the California *History-Social Science Framework* (California St. Dept. of Education, 1987). By the time the World studies phase took place, drafts of the national standards being developed for social studies and history were also consulted. The language objectives were selected to be compatible with the content and to promote development in listening, speaking, reading and writing, with specific attention to language tasks required in a social studies class, such as reading for specific information, taking notes, listening for details, generating an outline or timeline, presenting an oral report, and writing a comparison essay. Thinking and study skill objectives also matched the content objectives and led teachers to pose more higher-order questions and require more integrated tasks[4].

The lessons also included a mix of authentic and adapted materials. Use of authentic materials in the lessons would help prepare students to read mainstream textbooks, since teachers could support the students as they worked on comprehension skills. Some lessons relied on the original documents (such as the Declaration of Independence and Martin Luther's theses), reference and/or biographic material, and authentic poems, letters, songs, maps, and political cartoons. Several lessons offered practice using the class textbooks, guiding students to complete the activities while targeting their attention to key points in the narrative.

The adapted materials were written to bridge the gaps we found in the textbooks. In these units, we wanted to present students with information about the different gender, ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic status of peoples who lived in colonial America and around the world. In order to write these passages, we consulted trade and reference books, museum materials, and ethnic and cultural resource organizations. For the American history unit, activities were created in several lessons to reflect the perspectives and roles of Native Americans, African Americans, and women during the Revolutionary era and to help teachers relate the information to student diversity.

This task was more difficult for the World studies lessons. In general, although these lessons present diversity by virtue of their geographic location, most of the historical information available to us described the successful societies, or those which came in contact with Europeans,

[4] For more information on the connection among objectives, see Short, 1993.

and only a little of the information focused on non-dominant tribes (e.g., the Chimus in the Incan empire). For the units we prepared, we selected successful societies that have not always been acknowledged in past social studies texts and have explained some of the power relationships within the civilizations being studied. In these lessons, for example, we considered the social class systems among the Incas, the Japanese under the Tokugawa regime, and some of the different tribes in Ethiopia, but the diversity connection was more influenced by acknowledging the presence of historic civilizations and recognizing their contributions and legacies in the present day. The World studies lessons attempted to offer students some interesting role models from their own countries or continents, to demonstrate the ingenuity of the peoples and to display their daily lifestyles, concerns, and aspirations.

For most of the unit lessons, we prepared graphic organizers to assist student comprehension of the content objectives and reading passages, and to familiarize them with the more popular text structures. We were guided by the principle that representing information visually benefits language learners because it highlights important points and reduces dependence on written text. In creating graphic organizers, we drew from work conducted by Mohan and colleagues (Mohan, 1986, 1990; Early & Tang, 1991) who have developed a framework that provides graphic representations of text according to the type of knowledge structure embedded within. Some of the organizers in our lessons were intended to help students categorize and systematize the information they gathered. Some lessons use flow charts to organize information presented in a cause-effect manner; others use timelines to show chronological progression. Venn diagrams are employed to help students become aware of comparisons and tree diagrams help enumeration. Coupled with these structural organizers, teachers were encouraged to explore the rhetorical markers with the students–words signaling comparison, sequence, and so forth.

Hands-on activities were also designed to help reinforce content information and give students practice in communication skills. Because many students approach reading tasks with little background schema, the multiple modes of acquiring and reinforcing information are important. In a lesson that provides an overview of events that led to the Revolutionary War, for

example, students preview protest events and read about them in their textbooks. Each student is then given a sentence strip with either a date or an event written on it. Students with event strips must match up the date strips, then all the students arrange themselves in a physical timeline. An activity in the *Conflicts* material involved a board game that students played as a transition between discussing the European colonization of Africa and the units specifically treating Ethiopian resistance to colonization. In this game, students must associate their knowledge of the colonization process with longitude and latitude coordinates of African countries and map reading skills.

Thinking skills and study skills were also infused in the lessons. In some lessons, activities were designed to encourage students to consider multiple points of view, such as the opinions and loyalties of the African Americans and Native Americans living in the colonial period of U.S. history. In others, students were tasked with determining cause-effect relationships, both as a means of understanding the escalation of conflict and of considering alternative conflict resolutions. Other activities incorporating thinking skills were developed as well. For instance, student groups received problem cards representing difficulties that the Incas needed to overcome, such as a way to tell time, the means for crossing from one side of a deep canyon to another, or a way to preserve food through the winter, and are asked to create their own solutions, drawing pictures where appropriate before reading about the Incas answers to their problems. In addition, many lessons help students practice preparing and interpreting timelines, maps, graphs and outlines; summarizing information; understanding authentic source material and making decisions– all skills determined critical for middle school students by the National Council for the Social Studies task force on scope and sequence (Jarolimek, 1989).

Instructional Strategies

During the piloting and field-testing of the units, *Protest and the American Revolution* and *Conflicts in World Cultures*, we observed many successful classroom practices. The teachers who participated in our study carefully prepared the unit lessons in order to accommodate the needs of

their particular English language learners and, in several cases, created additional activities to supplant or support those in the original design. They used many of the techniques practiced in the training seminar we held and also modified others from their personal teaching repertoires.

For vocabulary development, the teachers selected and implemented strategies according to the content of the lesson. This was important because the lessons do not always provide specific instructions for teaching the vocabulary. Many of these strategies are excellent ESL techniques. It is noteworthy that they were used successfully in content area classes by content teachers and ESL/bilingual teachers. Sometimes the teachers opted for explicit vocabulary instruction, sometimes dictionary practice, and at other times they helped students learn to define vocabulary through context or showed students how to determine the general meaning of a sentence without knowing all the words. Much of the explicit instruction involved developing word webs as a class, eliciting relationships among key words and associations with other known words. Several teachers made use of cognates or words with Latin derivations. The use of demonstrations and illustrations were other effective ways to help students associate the written word with its meaning. Using pictures from the textbooks, newspaper photographs, realia, and pantomime, the teachers showed the students the meanings of such terms as stamp burning, political cartoons, destroying property, marches, shoguns, and terrace farming. Impromptu role plays, such as a performance of the Boston Massacre or the first meeting between the Incas and the Spanish conquistadors, were another means some teachers used to supply and reinforce key vocabulary. Vocabulary as well as the major historical events were also reinforced through artwork and writing projects. For example, students created three dimensional cubes to represent different types of protest and ladder brochures to show depict conflicts and the results of alternative resolutions. They wrote letters to the editor and to Dear Abby, designed flags and wrote explanations of the symbols, and prepared comparison-contrast essays.

Teaching the abstract concepts was a little more difficult, so many teachers relied on examples from the students' personal experiences and from current events to facilitate comprehension. To help understand representation, for instance, the teachers referred to the

schools' student councils and called on class representatives to explain how they make decisions for the class and how they inform the class about council meetings. To tie negotiation into the lessons, some teachers referred to peer mediation councils in the schools; others, to school assemblies held about conflict resolution. While we were conducting the classroom research, riots and other current events of protest occurred in the news (e.g., Los Angeles riots after the first Rodney King decision, the attempted coup d'état in Thailand, the democracy movements in Haiti and South Africa). By drawing student attention to these, teachers explained such ideas as point of view, oppression, self-government, conflict resolution, domination, resistance, and more.

These current events helped teachers build a foundation for background knowledge as well, although the expectations for background knowledge differed greatly between American history and World studies courses and textbooks. For the former, teachers had more time to develop background knowledge and understanding of the independence movement. As a single course covering only one country's history, students constructed knowledge along the way because events studied one day set future events in motion. World studies, however, approached knowledge in terms of breadth rather than depth. The "around the world in one hundred and eighty school days" survey approach was problematic for the English language learners. Rarely did they have time to practice using new vocabulary words or to make connections between concepts and events. Teachers had a few strategies for preparing students for the background knowledge, particularly reminding students of a similar event or process studied in an earlier section of the syllabus or relating the new information to something relevant to the adolescents' lives. To circumvent the background knowledge problem we used thematic instruction and related the lessons together in terms of conflict type and resolution alternatives.

One very successful strategy teachers used to help students complete the unit activities was modeling. Many of the teachers modeled the task, or a portion of it, with the class as a whole before breaking students into small groups. One teacher of a sheltered class, for example, helped students reflect on points of view of Native Americans and African Americans in pre-revolutionary America. In this lesson students were divided into small groups and had to list reasons for siding

with the British or the Patriots. Before they started their cooperative work, however, the teacher asked the whole class to generate one reason for each group. Another teacher, during the lesson on protest songs, began the class by having students listen to a recording of a modern protest song (from the Vietnam War era). She analyzed the song with the students in preparation for the revolutionary-era song activity they would complete later in the lesson. While preparing students to consider the qualifications that Ethiopian emperor, Menelik II, or U.S. Commodore Matthew Perry had to be leaders, a third teacher asked students to think of a good leader they knew and brainstorm important qualities. These qualities became a basis for evaluating Menelik and Perry subsequently in the lesson.

Teachers with mixed classes regularly relied on the English-speaking students as tutors and partners. For example, in the lesson where students do research on revolutionary protesters, the teacher of one class paired the English language learners with mainstream students who were familiar with library research. As mentors, these mainstream students were excellent assistants and reported afterward that they enjoyed working as partners. In bilingual classrooms, teachers not only let students assist one another in the non-English language in order to facilitate comprehension, but also allowed assignments to be completed in either language.

Academic Language of Social Studies

As explained earlier, the research component that focused on academic language examined three sources: textbooks, classroom oral discourse (including both teacher and student discourse), and student written work (including assignments, completed graphic organizers, creative writing, and expository essays). The academic language found in the textbooks has been described above, with particular emphasis on areas of concern for limited English proficient students: the treatment of vocabulary, the use of syntax and logical connectors, the cohesion within and across paragraphs, and the prevailing structure of the text. Information gathered from the other two sources follows.

Classroom Discourse Analysis

The audiotapes, textbook passages, and selected student work were used in our discourse analysis component, specifically to investigate the academic language competencies students need to learn and be able to use in social studies classes. By categorizing the language of social studies we hoped to inform language and social studies educators of specific areas that should receive attention when teaching English language learners. Such a typology, we reasoned, would also provide impetus to some teachers who might view language development practice as the domain of another.

During the course of our research we decided to define the academic language of social studies broadly to include semantic and syntactic features (such as vocabulary items, sentence structure, transition markers, and cohesive ties) and language functions and tasks that are part of social studies classroom routines. We anticipated identifying a restrictive social studies register, but we discovered instead that the academic language used in the social studies classes was commensurate with much of the academic language in other humanities courses and in fact, similar to the non-technical language used in math and science classroom discourse when teachers and students are explaining, reviewing, discussing, and so forth. We concluded, therefore, that the language of social studies is less restrictive than that of mathematics and that of sciences like chemistry and physics (Halliday, 1975; Lemke, 1982) where technical vocabulary and specific patterns of discourse are more prevalent. It is worth noting that although the language of social studies is similar to the language of other content areas and thus may not be exclusive to social studies, it is nonetheless required for successful participation in a social studies class.[5]

As can be seen in Table 3, we have identified the types of language features, functions, tasks and text structures that are apt to appear in social studies. The samples reflect the periods of history that we investigated. Certain instructional *tools* correspond closely to the social studies, such as globes and maps. The related language varies from key vocabulary words like "north" and

[5] See Snow, Met and Genesee (1989) for a discussion of language that is obligatory for understanding the material taught in a content course, such as the terms "evaporate" and "condense" in Physical Science, compared with language that is non-obligatory but compatible with language objectives developed in an ESL curriculum, yet could be taught in the science course, such as "if-then" structures and "because" clauses.

Table 3

SAMPLE FEATURES OF SOCIAL STUDIES LANGUAGE IN AMERICAN HISTORY CLASSES

Tools of Social Studies	**Related Language**
textbook	on page..., at the top, chapter, illustration
map	north, south, east, west, landforms
globe	latitude, longitude, continents
timeline	years, dates
graph, chart	title, percent, bar, pie, column, heading ,

Famous People/Events	**Related/Technical Vocabulary**
Samuel Adams	rebel, speech
Mercy Otis Warren	boycott, correspondence
Stamp Act	taxes, 'tar and feather'
2nd Continental Congress	represent, delegates
Lexington and Concord	militia, minutemen, musket

Concepts

propaganda	protest	taxation
patriotism	rebellion	justice
self-governing	independence	liberty

Language Functions

Students and Teachers		*Teachers*	
explain	give example	ask recall questions	rephrase
describe	sequence	give directions	extend
define	compare	encourage	review
justify	evaluate	clarify/restate	preview

Language Skills Tasks

read expository prose	find main idea, supporting details
take notes	present an oral report
conduct research	write a "cause and effect" essay

Text Structure

Macro (chapter level)	*Micro (paragraph level)*
cause and effect	compare and contrast
sequential/chronological order	generalization -example
problem-solution	enumerative

Syntax

Simple past	Sequence words	Temporal signals
Historical present	Active voice	Causative signals

"south" to general academic instructions like "look at the bottom of page 25." Teachers usually teach these terms and instructions directly and students learn them quickly. All disciplines have their *famous people and events*, though they may play a less important role in the overall curricula of mathematics and science courses. In social studies, they also engender related vocabulary, sometimes as hyponyms (e.g., Samuel Adams and rebel; Martin Luther and heretic), sometimes as activities undertaken (e.g., Mercy Otis Warren and boycott/Martin Luther and excommunication), sometimes as causes and results (e.g., Stamp Act and 'tar and feather'/cannon blasts and negotiations), and so forth. Teachers we observed often taught these associated vocabulary terms with word webs, pictures, and demonstrations. The *concepts*, such as "patriotism" and "independence," represent more abstract use of the language and were difficult to demonstrate physically or visually. The teachers relied more on concrete examples from the students' personal experiences and role-playing situations to help students comprehend the concepts.

The *language functions* and *skills tasks* are fairly consistent across the observed lessons and collected assignments. Several functions occur regularly in both student and teacher discourse, while other functions are much more in the domain of the teacher. For instance, both teachers and students are expected to define terms and give examples (although often the student is prompted by the teacher). Teachers, however, are more apt to rephrase student responses, conduct reviews of information, and give directions than are the students. In most classes we observed, in fact, teachers made considerable efforts to repeat, rephrase and extend student responses and comments in order to help all students participate and follow the lesson activity. Other tasks that occurred regularly in the social studies classrooms we visited are universal for all content areas, such as interpreting a map, reading a timeline, participating in a discussion and listening to a lecture.

We did note that in World studies classes, teachers were more apt to provide explicit background information to the topics. We reasoned this process occurred because of the breadth of materials to be covered and the relative unfamiliarity of the content for most middle school students. Teachers, as mentioned earlier, were apt to remind students of similar situations they had

studied in another part of the world, such as imperialism in South America when studying imperialism in Africa. In many instances, such as the mini-unit on Ethiopia, the teacher did not even have the textbook to support the development of student knowledge

Student Work

In conjunction with our classroom observations and textbook reviews, we gathered a variety of student work for analysis during this research study. The range of items included: responses on teacher-made tests and question-answer worksheets, completed graphic organizers used for pre-reading and pre-writing activities, note-taking forms, artwork, expository essays, letters, and news articles, research reports, and so forth. The items demonstrate some of the diverse activities that enabled the students to practice their language skills while learning the social studies content and reflect some of the features of academic language the students produced. For instance, tests and quizzes often asked students to identify and define terms through recall questions and at times, had them sequence events, make comparisons, or relate causes and effects. Note-taking required students to recognize and classify important information from the text, although students were often assisted with a graphic organizer that set up the categories in advance. Various essay and letter-writing assignments required students to synthesize, summarize, evaluate, express opinions, and make predictions.

The following "Letter to the Editor" written by a beginning ESL student from Haiti in a sheltered history class in metropolitan New York represents an activity that allows for some creativity but also asks for an opinion and highlights important civics objectives–the value of free speech, communicating with public officials, and participating in a political process:

> Dear Editor,
>
> While I was in Boston in 1770 the soldiers were shooting the citizens of Boston. Those citizens were not doing anything wrong. One of the man was black man is [his] name was Crispus Attucks he got shot too. I feel bad about what happened because the soldiers didn't have to shot the people. I hope that the soldiers be punish for what they did. I hope that those thing would solves [would be solved].
>
> Sincerely
> Josephine

In preparation for this task, the teacher had had his students examine letters to the editor from their local newspaper. Josephine clearly has the right tone for her letter, expressing her opinion and basing it on a factual situation. She offers a solution to the problem she perceives. She uses complex sentences yet needs some further instruction in writing mechanics.

In the next sample (see figure 1 on the next page), this student began the letter to the editor process with an organizer. Here she identified key points to cover, and despite not completing the final category (importance), she did include it in her letter.

In analyzing the letter, we see that the student was familiar with key vocabulary (e.g., revolutionary group, African American slaves, colonists, master, British) and concepts (e.g., freedom, slavery). The student uses the conjunctions *and* and *because* to connect thoughts in several compound sentences and one compound-complex sentence, and displays knowledge of cause and effect ("...if we're not going to fight British we'll have more slaves"). The student sets up her argument, gives her opinion, and justifies it. The task is one that covers critical social studies skills (as reported in Jarolimek, 1989): recognize and understand an increasing number of social studies terms, use the community newspapers, note cause and effect relationships, draw inferences from factual material, examine critically relationships between and among elements of a topic, communicate in writing, express personal convictions, and others.

We believed that by incorporating creative writing tasks in our lessons we could be more responsive to the needs of English language learners and also engage them more fully in the learning process. As we know from research on learning styles and multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1993; Kolb, 1984; Oxford, 1990), students respond to academic material in different ways and learn well through different modalities. One genre that is generally lacking from traditional social studies classes is creative writing. Expressive students, nonetheless, can demonstrate their knowledge through creative activities, such as those we have included. Furthermore, creative activities have the benefit of energizing a class, and for English language learners who may not function well in a lecture/textbook-based class, such activities can ease the stress of studying content through the second language. Through creative writing assignments,

Irina

Trudeva 5/3/94

Colonial Newspaper Letter to the Editor

Directions: Write a letter to the editor about your group's point of view telling the reasons you are fighting for the colonists or fighting for the British. Your letter should have four parts: 1) Describe the Revolutionary group you are a part of, 2) Tell whose side you are on, 3) Describe the reasons you have taken that side, and, 4) Tell why your point of view is important. Use the first half of the page to draft your letter. Use the second half for the final letter.

Draft:

Who (Revolutionary group): African American Slaves

Side (Fighting for the colonists or fighting for the British): colonists

Point of View (Reasons why you are fighting for the colonists or the British): I'm fighting for the colonists Because I want freedom like the other colonists.

Importance (Why your group's point of view is important):

Letter:

Dear Editor:

I'm from Revolutionary group of African American Slaves and I'm fighting with colonists against the British. I'm fighting for the colonists Because I want freedom and I want to go back to my country. And I don't want to have a master. It's not right to bring people from their own country and tell them to work for you. My point of view is important because if we're not going to fight British we'll have more slaves.

Irina

students are able to be reflective, use their own words, and craft their own sentences without needing to follow the rigid structures of English very closely. Overall, these tasks represent a departure from the traditional social studies fare, while reinforcing historical information through a different genre.

As an example of creative writing tasks our lessons have explored, we will look at poetry. One type of poem, the diamante, relies on parts of speech for its structure but knowledge of contrasts and characteristics for its essence. Students in a sheltered social studies class in a middle school in Los Angeles (mostly from Mexican-American backgrounds) created the following poems after studying the Inca social classes:

Priests
respected, faithfull
praying, sacrificing, advising
loyally, religiously; poorly, faithfully
tilling, growing, working stealing:
common, poor
Farmers

by Mindy

Farmers
humble, poor
enjoying; growing; hardworking
faithfully: noisely: selfishly: powerfully
stealing: imposing: counting
royal: amazed
Emperor

by Sofia

Corn
tortillas, grain
grinding, cooking, tasting
delicately, deliciously; cheerfully, painfully
burning, glowing, rising
bright, yellow
Sun

by Altagracía

A diamante poem, named by its shape, compares or relates two things and uses nouns, adjectives, present participles, and adverbs to do so. While showing students how to construct these poems, teachers can review or teach these grammatical items. A diamante begins describing one object and halfway through, after the second adverb in the fourth line, switches to the

describing the compared object. In these poems, students used their knowledge of life among the Incas to create their work. The first two poems describe members of different social classes in Incan society and represent the authors' interpretations of the Incas' activities and feelings. In the third poem, the author perhaps projects an aspect of her own culture in assuming the Incas ground corn into tortillas. Nonetheless, she captures the relationship between corn and the sun beautifully.

In examining the first poem more closely, it becomes clear that this student reflected on the social structure of Incan society and attributed characteristics to two groups of people found there. She interpreted the actions and feelings of the priests and farmers. Comprehension of key vocabulary and concepts emerges in the student's use of *respected*, *sacrificing*, *advising*, *tilling*, and *common*. The student associated the social position with its power relationships (e.g., respected v. common) and job responsibilities (e.g., advising v. tilling) and arranged the information appropriately. making interpretations, associating pieces of information, and arranging information–was successfully demonstrating comprehension of the text.

The following acrostic poem from the same class integrates the subtheme of cultural perceptions with the historical information regarding the first encounter between Incas and Spanish conquistadors.

The Incas Conflicting Interest

Pizzaro went back to Spain to ask permision to queen of Spain to conquer the Incas.
Every Inca thought Spanierds were Gods because the qualities like having beard, horses, ect.
Reception for the Spanierds from the Incas was great.
Cajamarca was the home of the Incas and Emperor Atahualpa
Emperor Altahualpa did not now about the bible and Christianity because he was the god of the sun and because he couldn't understand the bibble.
Pizarro held the Emperor Altahualpa captive.
The Emperor Altahualpa thought that the Spaniards were not immortal.
Incas at first thought the Spanierds were nice people but then changed the percepition.
Offerd Altahualpa his help with his enemies this was said by Pizarro
New perception was thought by the Incas after the Emperor held was prisoner.

by Altagracía

Altagracía incorporates a good deal of information that she learned through the mini-unit in this poem: the Incan legend about the god Virococha (gods with beards), religious influence on Spanish explorations and conquests (bible and Christianity) and on Incan society (god of the sun), where the emperor lived (Cajamarca), the trickery that occurred (Pizarro captured Atahualpa), Pizarro's awareness of civil war among the Incas (help with his enemies), and reasons that perceptions changed (Emperor was help prisoner). She uses key vocabulary terms as well as a variety of sentence types. Although, like the other students, she needs to improve her mechanics, her teacher has an excellent passage on which to base grammatical instruction.

A third poetic form, Haiku, was taught in the mini-unit on Japan to reflect part of the Japanese culture. In order to model the activity and discuss syllabilization, the teacher elicited key words from the class, a heterogeneous mix in metropolitan Washington, DC, and together they generated the first stanza. Individual students then wrote the following Haiku stanzas.

Class:

Matthew Perry sailed.
He came to Japan to trade.
He brought them presents.

Students:

Foreigners arrived
The Japanes were angery
They feared to much trade
by Oscar

His mission was hard
He feared Japanese attack
He might have been shot
by Gabrielle

Tokugawa
Beheaded farmers
Crusified all criminals
Yet they wanted peace
by Ramon

Again, although errors in the English mechanics appear, the social studies content is accurate. These students not only generated Haiku with the required syllables per line, but also created a cohesive message, indicating their vocabulary and concept comprehension. The first student writes from the Japanese perspective; the second, from Commodore Perry's. The third student describes the type of government present at the time of Perry's arrival and demonstrates understanding of the rationale behind the Tokugawa's strict laws: they wanted peace.

In general, our lessons have successfully used poetry as a reinforcement activity. Students have been enjoyed writing them, and more structured varieties, like those described here, have given students a framework to organize their thoughts. As can be seen from these samples, the students in our project still needed some improvement in their English language skills, but they had made substantial progress according to their teachers. Although some spelling, article usage, sentence fragments issues arise, the students are very capable of communicating complex thoughts and concepts. Their work demonstrates that the integration of academic language skills practice with social studies skills development can occur in a natural way with apparent success. As one teacher involved with the project told us, "Much to my surprise the students not only could do the poem but loved doing it. I thought 'Ok, I'll give it a shot because it's here but I expect nothing from it.' Instead, it turned out to be one of the most turned in homework assignments of the year! Kids who I hardly get anything from did this and did it well. There were some very touching poems."

The Culture of the Classroom

Overall, we have been very pleased with the implementation of the materials and the training in the classroom and the type and extent of discourse and language practice that emerged. Although this study did not measure student achievement or attitudes through an experimental design, the degree of participation by the students, as noted through classroom observations and teacher logs, and the degree of satisfaction on the teachers' parts, as expressed in interviews and through the logs, indicate the materials and teacher training were effective. Students were able to comprehend the subject matter through the integrated language and content approach, practice their academic language skills, produce products that mirrored those required in mainstream social studies classes, and connect their knowledge of and experiences with cultural diversity to topics in this academic setting.

The textbooks selected, curricula developed, standards established, and attitudes and actions undertaken by teachers set the cultural climate of a classroom. As research has shown,

most U.S. classrooms reflect the dominant societal culture. We believe our materials helped change the culture of the classrooms in which our students and teachers worked. These materials brought diversity to the forefront, tapped student knowledge and past experiences, accommodated different learning styles, and presented multiple perspectives in order to create a composite culture.

Explicit socializing of students to fit into the often implicit cultural expectations of the classroom (as in routines, turn-taking, participation rules) was also important. As Erickson and Shultz (1991) have discussed, student comfort with the social participation structure of an academic task, for instance, can vary according to culturally learned assumptions about appropriateness in communication and in social relationships, individual personality, and power relations in the classroom social system and in society at large. Therefore, many English language learners could benefit from being socialized into culturally appropriate classroom behaviors and interactional styles. As Bartolome (1994) states, teachers need to engage in culturally responsive teaching, so their instruction is sensitive to and builds upon culturally different ways of learning, behaving, and using language. Our teacher training components and the activities found in our lessons sought to facilitate the socialization process.

The following example will demonstrate the type of classroom culture shift we viewed in one project classroom. We observed a potential project teacher before he participated in the training seminar and began using the materials. He was a social studies trained teacher with a class full of beginning level English language learners and practiced a traditional transmission style. Students sat individually, in rows, facing front. The teacher stood at the front of the room most of the time and wrote on the blackboard behind him. The class had established routines–every Monday they had a lecture and took (copied) notes and were assigned homework; every Tuesday they did a worksheet or textbook questions; every Wednesday they reviewed homework; every Thursday they had a quiz (although the type of quiz varied); and every Friday they discussed current events. Students never volunteered information in the class. The teacher posed a question and students raised hands and were chosen to answer. They rarely worked in cooperative groups or pairs. (He acknowledged that he was not comfortable with that type of arrangement.) The

teacher's vocabulary presentation was limited to giving decontextualized dictionary-style definitions or providing French and Latin derivations of words, since most of the students spoke Haitian Kreyol. Students did not practice more complex oral language skills like clarifying, paraphrasing, and negotiating meaning. They responded primarily to recall/factual questions. The teacher did connect some of the current events (e.g., the democracy movement in Haiti and Aristide's ouster) studied to the students' home countries (Haiti, Mexico, and Peru) and the revolutionary and constitutional periods of American history.

By the next year, though, a transformation had occurred in the climate of the classroom. We saw the teacher arrange lessons around cooperative group activities. We heard students speak out, challenging the teacher and initiating questions. The energy level of the classroom had risen dramatically. The students were interacting orally with one another and with the teacher, making predictions, justifying comments, extending responses, and so forth. Students were asked to share information about their experiences as the teacher tried to explain historical concepts. The teacher himself began to act out vocabulary to demonstrate meaning to the students. In brief, the teacher had begun to create a composite culture in his classroom and he generated a better learning environment for the students. They had more responsibility for their learning, they practiced more oral language, they relied less on worksheets and textbook questions, and they were encouraged to discuss situations from their home countries that applied to the topics being studied, and not only on Friday.

Professional Development

The teachers who worked with us on this research project reported, through their journals and our interviews, that their involvement had a positive impact on their own professional development and on the quality of their lessons. The most frequent and most important growth areas from an instructional practice point of view were: conceptualizing the integration of language and content, using the lesson plan formats developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics and refined during this research project, implementing cooperative learning activities with English

language learners, thinking in metalinguistic terms (i.e., thinking about language, how to identify language features in content material and how to teach it), designing sheltered ESL curricula, developing thematic units, and taking a more interactive role in lessons. As was discussed above, many of the social studies trained teachers found they created new learning environments in their classrooms when they began to include their students' cultures and backgrounds in the lessons and activities.

Most of the teachers reported that they have been able to apply the themes and subthemes that were developed through the *Protest* and *Conflict* units to other lessons and other classes. Two teachers, for instance, used variations of the lessons with their gifted and talented students, none of whom was limited English proficient. Several teachers found connections between the themes of the world studies mini-units and other countries/regions/histories studied during the year. All the teachers indicated that they made repeated use of the instructional techniques, such as graphic organizers and pre-reading activities, throughout their year-long curricula. During the pilot phase of the lessons, our teacher-authors also wrote additional lessons that we then included with the revised versions. One teacher even wrote a unit on the Civil War following the *Protest and the American Revolution* model.

Project teachers also identified areas of growth in their professional outreach activities. As part of the project team, many teachers joined research staff as co-presenters at regional and national conferences. For example, three teachers presented with staff at the national TESOL convention in 1994 and one at TESOL in 1995. In 1994 and then in 1995, two different teachers presented with staff at the annual NCSS conferences. Some teachers presented on their own, as at the Texas Council for the Social Studies conference, the Illinois state ESL and bilingual conference, and the Washington area regional TESOL conference. Some of the teachers were also tapped by their schools and districts as new resources for working with ELLs. These teachers gave school and district in-service workshops and one teacher became a school mentor teacher. Moreover, a number of the teachers related that they worked with colleagues who taught other subjects (on middle school teams) to create some interdisciplinary, thematic units.

One teacher, in fact, underwent a professional shift. As a social studies teacher, he joined the project after learning about it from a colleague who was already a participating teacher. At that time, he was not familiar with the field of ESL but developed an interest, took some courses offered through his district, and participated actively in our project. After working with the project for two years, he decided to become an ESOL teacher when a slot opened at his school.

Project teachers also reported that the lesson plans had a positive impact on their students. The themes of protest and conflict, in particular, stimulated a high level of student participation. Students enjoyed many of the hands-on activities in the lessons and relied on graphic organizers to help grasp the information presented orally and through written form. They were able to combine both expository and creative writing in their work as well. In general, the teachers felt the students had developed their academic English language skills along with their social studies knowledge.

Outreach and Dissemination

This project has been actively engaged in outreach and dissemination activities throughout the five year period of the grant. Staff have presented regularly at national and regional conferences for language educators (e.g., Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), American Association of Applied Linguistics, National Association of Bilingual Education, WATESOL, Mid TESOL, FL TESOL, NYSTESOL), social studies educators (e.g., National Council for the Social Studies, Mid Atlantic Council for the Social Studies, Texas Council for the Social Studies), and other interested groups (e.g., National Association for Multicultural Education). Staff have also conducted invited workshops and training seminars with individual school districts across the United States (from Rhode Island to Florida to Nebraska to California), using strategies and materials developed through the project. Several universities that offer summer sessions for teachers (e.g., University of North Carolina-Charlotte, University of Vermont) asked staff to create and teach courses for their students.

At the offices of the Center for Applied Linguistics, project staff have also been responsive to requests for information about the project. For instance, we have sent out summaries of the

work, brief articles, publications, and other written matter. In addition we have offered advice on program design and teacher training, second language acquisition processes, and the integration of language and content instruction, over the phone, in person, and via the internet. In 1995, we also placed information about the project on CAL's World Wide Web home page and have responded to inquiries through that venue.

The project has resulted in a number of publications. Both curriculum units, *Protest and the American Revolution* and *Conflicts in World Cultures*, are available to the public as is an accompanying training module, *Integrating Language and Culture in the Social Studies: Teacher Training Packet.* An educational practice report (No. 8) was written as part of the National Research Center's report series, *Integrating Language and Culture in American History Classes.* We have also published a number of articles about the research study. In brief articles have appeared in language education and social studies education journals and in professional newsletters. In addition, one of the project teachers, Robin Liten-Tejada, was the subject of a video (No. 5) in the Research Center's video series. Entitled *Profile of Effective Teaching in a Multilingual Classroom,* this video shows Ms. Liten-Tejada working with her students in social studies and other subject areas. For a complete list of project publications, see Appendix C.

IMPLICATIONS

During this five year project, we have come to realize that despite the challenge that social studies presents to English language learners, there is reason to integrate the subject in content-based instruction. First, the subject is relevant and meaningful, so students can develop their communicative language skills through social studies topics that are part of their grade-level curriculum. Second, with teacher assistance, students can acquire and practice the academic skills that will serve them well in the mainstream classroom, such as using textbooks and source material and practicing note-taking, study skills, and higher-level thinking tasks. Because the academic language demands of social studies mirrors many of the higher level literacy demands of other content areas, an integrated language and social studies course may be an appropriate springboard for students who will make the transition to mainstream classes.

The integration of language, culture, and social studies, however, does not happen overnight. As our research revealed, it was important to develop instructional materials designed for this purpose (there being very few available commercially) and train teachers not only in how to use the materials but in aspects of second language acquisition, ESL methodologies and classroom discourse strategies. over time, teachers begin to recognize and harness the resources their English language learning students bring to the classroom and create a positive learning environment.

Language educators recognize that the integration of language and content instruction is, in the broader scheme of language teaching, a fairly new approach. As the survey by the Center for Applied Linguistics (1994) revealed, it is also a practice that is implemented quite differently across the United States. One strong recommendation emanating from the field is for language teachers and content teachers to work together to plan instruction and prepare materials. The research study discussed in this article has shown that such collaboration can be quite effective. Two teachers with ESL and social studies experience worked with project staff to write the original unit. They also participated as trainers in the joint seminar we held for the other teachers—ESL, bilingual, and social studies—who would become our field-testers. Additional content experts were consulted to

review the materials. The influence and expertise of these language and content educators enhanced the content accuracy, the practicality, the cultural information, and the language integration of the lessons. Through collaboration these lessons were specially designed to serve the curriculum needs of social studies students as well as the language development needs of English language learners.

Implications for instruction and program design

The project reported on here has provided examples of strategies teachers can use to present the academic language of social studies to English language learners in an interactive manner. The extensive use of graphic organizers assisted reading comprehension, vocabulary and content concepts retention, thinking and study skill development, and process writing skills. Hands-on and cooperative learning activities, such as role plays, sentence strips, art projects, research assignments, and more provided frequent opportunities for students to engage in communicative skills practice while they were learning social studies objectives. The teachers were also careful to concentrate on key social studies skills such as interpreting timelines and maps, examining information from an historical perspective, and comparing and contrasting historical events and people, so students would be better prepared for the demands of the mainstream social studies classroom.

Teachers need to use textbooks judiciously, however, with respect to language development. Adequate treatment of vocabulary does not exist so teachers must instruct students in methods for uncovering meanings of unknown words (often achieved through classroom discussion and context analysis) and should also spend time on pre-reading vocabulary activities. To help students understand the structure of text passages and develop cohesive use of academic language, teachers need to conduct activities to teach and reinforce the use of signal words that cue relationships (e.g., cause and effect, sequential order, comparisons) and to identify structural frames in reading and writing. Our classroom observations support the claim that these signal words and text structures can be helpful for English language learners when they are explicitly

taught to recognize them and understand their functions. Students we observed were better able to follow the relationships among the concepts presented in their text reading passages. They used the structures as organizing frames for attaching new information being presented. (See Coelho, 1982 and Meyer, 1984 for related discussions.) All of these teacher strategies aided students in comprehending and using the academic language of social studies and in strengthening their knowledge of the subject matter.

In comparing the two types of courses, American history and World studies, we found commonalities in the tools of social studies and the language functions and tasks and differences in the concepts and technical vocabulary. However, the integration of cultural diversity turned out to be more difficult for writing the individual world studies units because less information about the diverse peoples inhabiting the regions at the times studied was available. On the face of it, the World studies appeared more culturally diverse because different cultures were featured in the mini-units. In one sense this allowed more students to connect personally to the material, but the intra-unit material was more challenging to display multiple perspectives. Nonetheless, the opportunities for teachers to recognize and even plan for students to act as cultural and historical resources and informants were more promising.

Through an integrated approach to language and social studies instruction, it is important to remember that the implicit curriculum that invades the classrooms through these textbooks is difficult to combat. Both the literature review and this study's small-scale textbook analyses revealed that the cultures, histories, motivations, and actions of non-European American groups are inadequately covered in textbooks (if at all). Therefore, language minority students who read these books do not find a place for themselves and their heritages on the curriculum table. Although a few contributions of famous people may be scattered throughout some books, the overall narrative exalts the dominant culture, the European Americans. Sidebars and tagged-on chapters may be a first step towards improving the multicultural content of the textbooks, but they are not the ultimate destination.

Teachers who use these books with students will need to supplement the information with multiple perspectives from teacher-gathered resources. The negative spin that appears in many of the books needs to be countered through sensitive instruction and a critical thinking approach. The textbooks examined in this research and through the literature do not demonstrate validation of students' culture, making it more difficult to create a shared culture in the classroom. Yet, a composite culture that fosters trust and learning as Jordan (1992) and Erickson (1993) have proposed, should be the goal, resulting in a positive classroom environment for students which could lead to greater academic success.

The thematic framework was a critical tool for the curricular unit. As more courses and materials are designed to integrate language development activities with specific content skills, we recommend thematic instruction be used as an organizing framework. Not only did the protest and conflict themes provide underlying connections among the lessons, they favored reinforcement and repetition of vocabulary, review and extension of content knowledge, and most importantly, associations with students' experiences and knowledge on a personal level. Protest, conflict, and conflict resolution were active features in many of the students' lives in their own countries as well as an aspect of their daily experience in the U.S. Although the students may not have realized the historical significance that protest and conflict have played in the world, by drawing attention to their experiential knowledge, teachers enabled students to grasp important historical concepts, such as the struggle for independence, the desire to protect one's homeland, and the need to promote new ideas and debate without constraints.

For future program design opportunities, we would like to suggest the following: First, language development should be an integral component of content lessons designed for English language learners, so they may practice their language skills in a systematic manner. Second, social studies materials and curricula should make a concerted effort to be inclusive and provide as much information as possible about the cultural diversity of the society being examined. Diversity should not be an add-on or a throw-away when instructional time is limited. Textbooks should not be relied upon to fulfill this obligation. Third, social studies instruction should provide multiple

perspectives on history, and viewpoints of different groups should not be addressed in a cursory way. These last two recommendations may need to be accomplished through a combination of adapted and authentic reading passages that supplement the textbook. Fourth, teachers and students should strive to develop a composite culture in the classroom. Within this composite culture, teachers would work to accommodate student learning styles and help socialize them to the expected cultural behaviors in US classrooms, developing in the end a climate where the teacher and students are comfortable learning together.

Implications for future research

In the future it would be enlightening to conduct research that follows a cohort of English language learners from an integrated language and social studies course into mainstream classes and determine whether they are more prepared, in terms of background schema and familiarity with social studies functional language and academic tasks, than students who are not exposed to an integrated course. Our research indicates that the academic language demands of social studies reflect many of the higher level literacy demands of other content areas, so we posit that an integrated language and social studies course would be a pivotal course in an articulated sequence that prepares English language learners for full transition to the mainstream.

Research might also be conducted in conjunction with graduate schools of education. It would be worthwhile to design methodology courses for content area teachers, such as social studies teachers-to-be, that would develop their skills in integrating language and content instruction. Then it could be studied whether or not they were more prepared for the diverse student populations they will encounter in their classrooms and are more able to present comprehensible instruction to English language learners while also fostering their academic language development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramowitz & Abramowitz. (1981). *The United States: Peoples and leaders*. Cleveland, OH: Modern Curriculum Press.

Adamson, H.D. (1990). ESL students' use of academic skills in content courses. *English for Specific Purposes*, 9(1): 67-87.

Ahmad, I., Brodsky, H., Crofts, M., & Ellis, E. (1993). *World cultures: A global mosiac*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Alvermann, D. (1987). Strategic teaching in social studies. In Jones,B.F., Palinscar, A.S., Ogle, D.S. & Carr, E.G. (Eds.), *Strategic teaching and learning: Cognitive instruction in the content areas*, (pp. 92-110). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

American Association for the Advancement of Science. (1989). *Science for all Americans*. Washington, DC: Author.

Apple, M.W. (1992). The text and cultural politics. *Educational Researcher, 21*(7), 4-11, 1991.

Apple, M.W. & Christian-Smith, L.K. (Eds.). (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.

Armbruster, B.B., Anderson, T.H., & Meyer, J.L. (1990). *Improving content area reading using instructional graphics*. Technical Report No. 508. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Armento, B., Klor de Alva, J., Nash, G., Salter, C., Wilson, L., & Wixson, K. (1994). *To see a world*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Armento, B., Nash, G., Salter, C., & Wixson, K. (1991). *A more perfect union*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Armento, B., Nash, G., Salter, C., & Wixson, K. (1991). *America will be*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Bailey & Kennedy (1991). *The American pageant*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Bailey & Kennedy (1987). *The American pageant*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Bailey & Kennedy (1983). *The American pageant*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Bailey & Kennedy (1979). *The American pageant*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Baker, G.C. (1994). *Planning and organizing for multicultural instruction*. Second edition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Banks, J. & Banks, C.A.M. (Eds.). (1989). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bartolome, L. I. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 64*(2), 173-194.

Beck, I.L. & McKeown, M.G. (1991). Social studies texts are hard to understand: Mediating some of the difficulties. *Language Arts*, 68: 482-490.

Beck, I.L., McKeown, M.G. & Gromoll, E.W. (1989). Learning from social studies texts. *Cognition and Instruction, 6*(2), 99-158.

Bernstein Cohen, C. (1986). Teaching about ethnic diversity. *ERIC Digest No. 32*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Brophy, J.E. & Alleman, J. (1991). *Social studies instruction should be driven by major social education goals*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State Univeristy, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Brophy, J., McMahon, S. & Prawat, R. (1991). Elementary social studies series: Critique of a representative example by six experts. *Social Education, 55*(3), 155-160.

California State Department of Education. (1987). *History-Social Science framework*. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Cantoni-Harvey, G. (1987). *Content-area language instruction: Approaches and strategies*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Center for Applied Linguistics. (1994). *Content-ESL across the U.S.A.* Washington, DC: Author.

Chamot, A.U. & O'Malley, J.M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(2): 227-249.
Chapman, A. (1983). Women's history. *The Social Studies, 74*(1), 29-34.
Coelho, E. (1982). Language across the curriculum. *TESL Talk*, 13(3): 56-70
Collier, V. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(2): 509-532.
Collier, V. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(3), pp. 617-641.
Crabtree, C., Nash, G., Gagnon, P., & Waugh, S. (Eds.) (1992). *Lessons from history: Essential understandings and historical perspectives students should acquire* . Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles/National Center for History in the Schools.
Crandall, J.A. (1993). Content-centered learning in the United States. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13: 111-126.
Crandall, J.A. (Ed.) (1987). *ESL in content-area instruction.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
Crawford, L.W. (1993). *Language and literacy learning in multicultural classrooms.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.
Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14(2): 175-187.

Dansereau, D. F., & al, e. (1979). Development and evaluation of a learning strategy training program. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*, 64-73.
Dreher, M. J., Singer, H., & Letteer, C. A. (1986). *Explicitness in sixth-grade social studies textbooks* (Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX, 1986.
Drum, P. A. (1984). Children's understanding of passages. In J. Flood (Ed.), *Promoting Reading Comprehension* (pp. 61-78). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Early, M. & Tang, G.M. (1991). Helping ESL students cope with content-based texts. *TESL Canada Journal*, 8(2): 34-45.
Erickson, F. (1993). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. In E. Jacob & C. Jordan (Eds.), *Minority education: Anthropological perspectives*, pp. 27-51. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1991). Students' experience of the curriculum. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum* . New York: Macmillan.

Finkelstein, J.M., Nielsen, L.E. & Switzer, T. (1993). Primary elementary social studies instruction: A status report. *Social Education, 57*(2), 64-69.
Fleming, D.B. (1982). Latin America and the United States: What do United States history textbooks tell us? *The Social Studies, 73*(4), 168-171.
Franklin, M.R. & Roach, P.B. (1992). Teaching reading strategies in social studies contexts. *Social Education*, 56(7): 385-388.
Freeland, K. (1991). *Managing the social studies curriculum.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publications.
Freeman, D.E. & Freeman, Y.S. (1991). "Doing" social studies: Whole language lessons to promote social action. *Social Education*, 55(1): 29-32, 66.

García, E. (1994). *Understanding and meteing the challenge of student cultural diversity.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). Some aspects of sociolinguistics. In E. Jacobson (Ed.), *Interactions between linguistics and mathematics education* (pp. 64-73). Final Report of the Symposium sponsored by UNESCO, CEDO, and ICMI. Nairobi, Kenya, September 1-11, 1974. Paris: UNESCO.

Harris, R.L., Jr. (1983). From inclusion to interpretation: Teaching Afro-American history in the 1980s. *The Social Studies, 74*(1), 25-28.

Herber, H.L. (1970). *Teaching reading on content areas.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Holt, D., Chips, B., & Wallace, D. (1992). *Cooperative learning in the secondary school.* Program Information Guide No. 12. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Illinois Office of Education. (1975). *Guidelines for the evaluation and selection of ethnically valid instructional materials.* Springfield, IL: Author.

Jackson & Perrone. (1991). *Two centuries of progress.* Mission Hills, CA: Glencoe, McGraw-Hill.

Jarolimek, J. (1989). In search of a scope and sequence for social studies. *Social Education, 53*(6): 376-385.

Jordan, C. (1992). The role of culture in minority school achievement. *The Kamehameha Journal of Education, 3*(2), 53-66.

Keith, S. (1991). The determinants of textbook content. In Altbach, P.G., Kelly, G.P., Petrie, H.G., & Weis, L. (Eds.), *Textbooks in American society: Politics, policy and pedagogy,* pp. 43-59. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

King, M., Fagan, B., Brátt, T. & Baer, R. (1987). ESL and social studies instruction. In J.A. Crandall (Ed.), *ESL through content-area instruction: Mathematics, science and social studies,* (pp. 89-133). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kunder, L.H. (1976). *Procedures for textbook and instructional materials selection.* Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Lemke, J.L. (1982). *Classroom communication of science.* Final Report. NSF/RISE #SEDR 79-18961. New York: CUNY, Brooklyn College of Education. [ED 222346].

Love, R. (1989a). Social studies texts: What do they really teach? Part 1. *IDRA Newsletter, March 1989.* San Antonio: IDRA.

Love, R. (1989b). Social studies texts: What do they really teach? Part 3. *IDRA Newsletter, June 1989.* San Antonio: IDRA.

Mason, Jacobs, & Ludlum, (1992). *History of the United States to 1877.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Matte, J.A. (1993). Southeastern Indians, precontact to the present: Introductory essay. *Social Education, 57*(6), 292-302.

May, S.A. (1993). Redeeming multicultural education. *Language Arts, 70,* 364-372.

Mehan, H. (1991). *Sociolinguistic foundations for the study of cultural diversity.* Research report No. 1. Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning and the Center for Applied Linguistics.

Meyer, B. (1984). Organizational aspects of text: Effects on reading comprehension and applications for the classroom. In J. Flood (Ed.), *Promoting reading comprehension* (pp. 113-138). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Michigan State Board of Education. (1984). *A study of selected eighth grade United States history textbooks. 1982-83 Michigan Social Studies textbook study.* Volume I. Lansing, MI: Michigan State Board of Education.

Minicucci, C., & Olsen, L. (1992). *Programs for secondary LEP students: A California study.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Mohan, B.A. (1986). *Language and content.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Mohan, B. (1990). Integration of language and content. In *Proceedings of the first research symposium on limited English proficient students' issues* (pp. 113-160). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.

National Council for the Social Studies (1994). *Curriculum standards for social studies.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1992). Curriculum guidelines for multicultural education. *Social Education,* 56(5): 274-294.

National Council for Teachers of Mathematics. (1989). *Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics.* Reston, VA: Author.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

O'Connor, J. (1991). *Exploring American history.* New York: Globe.

O'Connor, J. (1986). *Exploring American history.* New York: Globe.

Parker, W. (1981). *Renewing the social studies curriculum.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Prouty Rosenfeld, C. (1976). *A chronology of Menelik II of Ethiopia.* Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, African Studies Center.

Risinger, C.F. (1992). *Trends in K-12 social studies* (No. EDO-SO-92-8). ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Risinger, C. F. (1987). *Improving writing skills through social studies* (No. 40). ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Schwartz, M. & O'Connor, J. (1988). *The non-western world.* New York: Globe.

Sleeter, C.E. & Grant, C.A. (1991). Race, class, gender and disability in current textbooks. In M.W. Apple & L.K. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook,* pp.78-110. New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. & Grant, C. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 421-444.

Short, D. (1994). Expanding middle school horizons: Integrating language, culture and social studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(3): 581-608.

Short, D. (1993). *Integrating language and culture in middle school American history classes.* Educational Practice Report No. 8. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Short, D. (1991). *How to integrate language and content instruction: A training manual.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Short, D.J. (1989). Adapting materials for content-based language instruction. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin,* 13(1). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Short, D., Mahrer, C., Elfin, A., Liten-Tejada, R., & Montone, C. (1994). *Protest and the American revolution.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Short, D., Montone, C., Frekot, S., & Elfin, A. (in progress). *Conflicts in world cultures.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Snow, M., Met, M. & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly,* 23(2): 201-217.

Tharp, R. & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life.*

Thorton, S. J. (1994). The social studies near century's end: Reconsidering patterns of curriculum and instruction. *Review of Research in Education, 20,* 223-254.

Tyson-Bernstein, H. (1988). *A conspiracy of good intentions: America's textbook fiasco.* Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.

Vacca, R. & Vacca, J. (1993). *Content-area reading.* New York: HarperCollins.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds. and Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weatherford, J. (1991). Indian season in American schools. *The Social Studies, 82*(5), 172-175.

Woodward, A. (1987). Textbooks: Less than meets the eye. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19*(6), 511-526.

Zeichner, K.M. (1993). *Educating teachers for cultural diversity.* NCRTL Special Report. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Appendix A

Integrating Language and Culture in the Social Studies

Research Questions:

1. What linguistic competence do students need to succeed in social studies?

2. What cultural competence (i.e., background schema) are students in general expected to bring to the class and how much of this do language minority students have?

3. What cultural concepts are difficult to comprehend in the social studies course?

4. What are common methodologies, techniques, and activities in social studies classes and do they complement what language minority students can do or are experienced doing?

5. What resources can these language minority students bring to the classroom (e.g., information about different cultural customs) to expand the global perspective of social studies?

6. What methods do effective teachers use to elicit cultural information from language minority students and to help them participate in class, develop language proficiency, and learn about American culture?

Appendix B

American History Textbook Analysis. Textbook title:_____

I. **Chronology**
A. Order of the events described

B. How many chapters cover the time frame 1763-1775 and Revolutionary War battles 1775-1781.

C. Previews to units and chapters. What do they do?

D. Overall impressions of book/unit.

E. Other items of interest.

*EVENT:*_____

II. **Space Allocation per event**
A. Number of paragraphs

B. Number of sentences

C. Number of words

III. **Chronology per event**
A. Order subevents are described.

IV. **Headings and subheadings**
A. Appropriate to content/Informative

V. **Illustrations**
A. Do they match reading passages? Are they on the same page as the reading passage? Do captions correspond to the pictures?

B. Variety of illustrations/Instances of multicultural or ethnic illustrations

C. Do illustrations correspond to chapter objectives/goals

VI. **Social Studies language**
A. Key words

B. Concepts

C. How vocabulary is introduced and/or explained

D. Are vocabulary words or concepts set apart (e.g. bold)?

E. Glossary
1. Does it contain only highlighted words?

F. Number of new words/vocabulary words and concepts introduced for each event

VII. **Content in terms of student point of view**
A. Development/explanation of background schema

VII. **Syntax**
A. Types of sentences

1. Number of active sentences

2. Number of passive sentences

3. Number of simples sentences

4. Number of compound sentences

5. Number of complex sentences

6. Number of compound-complex sentences

B. Topic sentences
1. Does each paragraph have a topic sentence?

2. Are topic sentences clear within paragraphs?

IX. Discourse

A. Cohesion between paragraphs and sections

1. Specific examples of cohesion (transitional words, time connectors, event links

B. Readability of text

X. Gender inclusion and multiculturalism

A. Gender discussion

B. Discussion of different cultural groups

C. Stereotyping

D. Tokenism

XI. Use of original sources

A. Does the book make use of /include excerpts from original sources?

XII. Sidebars of information

A. What do they address?

XIII. Other information of interest

World Studies Textbook Analysis. Textbook title:_____

I. Organizational Set-up

A. Does the book tend to attach the interesting/cultural/diverse chapters on to the end of a unit rather than incorporating the information within the main narrative?

II. Chronology

A. Placement of unit topics within the chapter of book unit (order of the events described)

B. How many chapters (pages/paragraphs) cover the time frames of the unit topics.

C. Previews to units and chapters. Are there previews? What do they do? What do they cover--historical or cultural information, visuals (maps, timelines)?

D. Overall impressions of book/unit.

E. Other items of interest.

*EVENT:*_____

II. Space Allocation per event

A. Number of paragraphs

B. Number of sentences

III. Chronology per event

A. Order subevents are described.

IV. Headings and subheadings

A. Appropriate to content/Informative

V. Illustrations

A. Do they match reading passages? Are they on the same page as the reading passage? Do captions correspond to the pictures?

B. Variety and type of illustrations

C. Instances of multicultural or ethnic illustrations

D. Do illustrations correspond to chapter objectives/goals

VI. Social Studies language

A. Key words

B. Concepts

C. How vocabulary is introduced and/or explained

D. Are (key) vocabulary words or concepts set apart (e.g. bold)?

E. Glossary
   1. Does it contain only highlighted words?
   2. Do the definitions differ from ones given in the chapters?

F. Number of new words/vocabulary words and concepts introduced for each event

VII. Content in terms of student point of view

A. Development/explanation of background schema

B. How do they contextualize the information (within the country? continent? world? time frame?)

VII. Syntax

A. Types of sentences
   1. Number of active sentences
   2. Number of passive sentences
   3. Number of simple sentences
   4. Number of compound sentences
   5. Number of complex sentences
   6. Number of compound-complex sentences

B. Topic sentences
   1. Does each paragraph have a topic sentence?
   2. Are topic sentences clear within paragraphs?

IX. **Discourse**

A. Cohesion between paragraphs and sections (links)

1. Specific examples of cohesion (transitional words, time connectors, event links)

B. Readability of text (choppiness, vocabulary, voice, referents)

X. **Gender inclusion and multiculturalism**

A. Gender discussion

B. Discussion of different cultural groups (especially within one country)

C. Stereotyping

D. Tokenism

XI. **Use of primary sources/authentic material**

A. Does the book make use of /include excerpts from primary sources?

XII. **Sidebars of information**

A. What do they address?

XIII. **Other information of interest**

Appendix C

Publications for Integrating Language and Culture in the Social Studies

Mahrer, C., & Short, D. (1993). The Midnight Rides of Paul Revere and Sybil Ludington: An Interdisciplinary Lesson for Middle School Students. Unpublished manuscript. Center for Applied Linguistics.

Montone, C., & Short, D. (1994). Bringing a Reading Passage to Life: A Creative Comprehension Activity. Unpublished manuscript. Center for Applied Linguistics.

National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. (1994). *Integrating Language and Culture in Middle School American History Classes.* ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse for Languages and Linguistics.

Short, D. (in press). Reading, 'Riting and...Social Studies: Integrated Classrooms at the Secondary Level.

Short, D. (in press). Integrating Language, Culture and Social Studies: A Bridge to Mainstream Classes.

Short, D. (1994). Expanding Middle School Horizons: Integrating Language, Culture and Social Studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 28* (3).

Short, D. (1994). Will There be Opportunities for English Language Learners to Reach High Standards? A Report of the Goals 2000 Standards Projects. Unpublished manuscript. George Mason University.

Short, D. (1994). The Challenge of Social Studies to Limited English Proficient Students. *Social Education, 58* (1).

Short, D. (1993). *Integrating Language and Culture in Middle School American History Classes.* Educational Practice Report No. 8. Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Short, D., Mahrer, C., Elfin,A., Liten-Tejada, R., & Montone, C. (1994). *Protest and the American Revolution.* Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Short, D., & Montone, C. (1996). *Integrating Language and Culture in the Social Studies: Teacher Training Packet.* Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Short, D., Montone, C., Frekot, S., & Elfin, A. (1996). *Conflicts in World Cultures.* Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Short, D., & Whitcher, A. (1995). Meeting the Challenge of Teaching in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Settings: Reflections on a Center's Progress. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin, 19* (1).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☐ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☒ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").